

against a large number of public officials occupying responsible positions. Among them are those who constitute the vast organization of the Fuel Administration, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Director General of Railroads, the Food Administration, so far as it dealt with sugar, and then in general "all operations of the Government."

There can be found no commendation of the acts of anyone now performing the duties referred to except the Food Administration with respect to dealings other than with sugar, and as to such other dealings he says he has made no investigation.

There are no words of encouragement for the sugar refiners and dealers who voluntarily reduced prices and sacrificed profits which would have reached stupendous sums, and there are no words of commendation of the mine workers who made important concessions in order to insure a continued and increased production of coal during the war, nor of the mine operators and the railroad operatives who brought about an enormous increase in the production of coal in 1917, far in excess of any previous record. There are no words of commendation for the host of men and women who, at great personal sacrifice, are serving the country. There are no words of commendation for the various industrial operators who have entered the service of the Government upon agreement for large reduction of prices. There is no recognition of the vast and invaluable service of the War and Navy Departments or the Shipping Board. I do not call attention to these matters for the purpose of having it appear that the Senator from Massachusetts is scolding indiscriminately. Here we have an example of studied and deliberate word lashing, and there may be some deep and controlling purpose which I am unable to fathom. I observe one train of thought constantly recurring throughout the speech, and which seems to constitute the controlling solicitude of the author. At every turn we are admonished that business should be interfered with as little as possible, that the laws of supply and demand should be accorded unhampered sway, that profits should be relied upon to increase production, that business should be permitted to control itself, all interspersed with frequent innuendoes that those charged with responsibility at this time would enjoy if they did not seek the woeful spectacle of business unnecessarily hampered, uselessly interfered with, needlessly shackled, and utterly demoralized. Just why such an effort should be entered upon I do not know, but doubtless it will occur to some casual readers that the silent appeal and solicitude were not wholly disconnected with the thought of future political campaigns.

Mr. President, the resolution which brought on the investigation of sugar and coal directed that the committee should report their recommendation of things necessary to be done with a view of remedying conditions. The Senator from Massachusetts specifies a very large number of conclusions and suggestions, but inasmuch as he finds that the policies of the Food Administration brought on a famine in sugar and that the Fuel Administration should be abolished, it seems that all other suggestions may be laid aside. In connection with the fuel discussion, and I have no doubt the inference was intended to apply to all other things discussed, the Senator quotes the expression often heard:

It is easy to criticize and find fault—what would you have substituted?

And then adds:

That question, in my opinion, can be as easily answered as asked.

Here is a cocksureness expected to be found in certain species of young college graduates but not looked for among matured statesmen or professors of literature. If all the questions presented in this investigation can be as easily answered as asked, we wonder whether the investigation brought any enlightenment or whether the answers were ready before the investigation, and whether the investigation was the cause of this remarkable speech or only afforded the occasion.

Mr. President, the conclusions which I have reached are not in accord with those of the Senator from Massachusetts. The Directors of the Food and Fuel Administrations are men splendidly equipped, having both natural and acquired executive ability as administrators of high order, and were well chosen for their respective positions. The organizations have brought together a large number of expert business men who, through toil and study, have reached eminent position in the respective lines of industry with which they are to deal. All are serving the country solely for patriotic reasons. There is no inducement of a pecuniary nature. The great majority receive no salaries and pay their own living expenses. They are devoting their whole time to this service. They are even endangering their health. The problems confronting them are recognized as important and perplexing. Day after day, night after night, the

combined wisdom and skill of these organizations is devoted to the solution of these problems, to meeting changed conditions, and if these problems can be dealt with so as to overcome the myriad difficulties presented and interfere with business as little as possible these organizations will do it.

The remedy therefore is, let these organizations alone. If they need more power, give it. Do not badger and heckle them. On the other hand, help and encourage them. Let us not say to the world that the affairs of our Government at this time are in incompetent hands. To the contrary, let us tell the truth and say to the world that the resources of this country are being successfully mobilized for the purposes of the war. Let us encourage the toilers in the mines and fields and those engaged in the essential service of transportation. Let us encourage the women in the land who are striving and on whom we must depend to conserve food for ourselves and our allies. Let us assure business in general that we have not entered upon an era of willful destruction. Let us not say to the taxpayers that their contributions are supporting inefficiency. Let us say to all those who are making sacrifices in this emergency that their efforts are not in vain. Let us uphold the hands of all those who are serving us in these hours of dire distress, and pray almighty God to sustain and strengthen them. Let us all be Americans; let us come together; let us work together; let us counsel together, so that this Republic "shall not perish," but shall remain "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I had hoped to bring up some of the military legislation this afternoon, but because of the lateness of the hour, and because I feel confident that I can have it considered to-morrow, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 23, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, March 22, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, look down from Thy throne of grace, with favor upon the entente powers at the front, who may be at this moment engaged in a death struggle which promises the greatest battle of the ages, not only for the numbers engaged but for the great principles involved, against an insidious foe who would turn back the tide of civilization and subjugate all lovers of liberty to the power of might.

Give strength, courage, victory to our arms, that right may live and wrong die, to the honor and glory of Thy holy name, and thus for the good of all mankind.

Let Thy favor descend upon these soldiers gathered here today at this Capitol. Be with them now, and be with them when they face the enemy, and bring them, without the loss of any, we beseech Thee, home to us again, and everlasting praise shall be Thine. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SCREEN-WAGON CONTRACT OF H. H. HOGAN, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 3689.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 3689. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, can it be reported?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3689) authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the screen-wagon contract of H. H. Hogan at Kansas City, Mo.

Be it enacted, etc., That should the Postmaster General find as a fact that the screen-wagon contract of H. H. Hogan, of Kansas City, Mo., was entered into prior to the entrance of the United States into the war with Germany, and that the prices agreed to be paid in said contract are at the present time inequitable and unjust by reason of the increase in the cost of materials and labor employed in the performance of such contract, the Postmaster General is authorized, in his discretion, with the consent of the said H. H. Hogan and his bondsmen, to cancel the same or to readjust the terms of said contract in such manner as to relieve the contractor from the hardships being by him suffered on account of such increased costs and expenses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What is the request, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The request is to consider this bill that has just been read.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Has it been reported from a committee?

The SPEAKER. Yes; it is a Senate bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Has it been reported back by a House committee?

The SPEAKER. Yes. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BORLAND, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial in Washington to the memory and in the honor of the members of the various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses on battle fields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals during the Civil War.

CIVIL-SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina, by direction of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, presented for printing under the rule the conference report on Senate joint resolution 117, amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 402).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

H. L. GODWIN,
C. D. CARTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LONERGAN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Connecticut rise?

Mr. LONERGAN. I rise to ask unanimous consent that after completing the consideration of the pending bill pension bills may be next in order for consideration.

Mr. GILLET. Does the gentleman mean to-day?

Mr. LONERGAN. Yes; if we finish the pending bill to-day.

The SPEAKER. If you set a time to-day, that would be pertinent, but the House by special order set to-morrow for the consideration of the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that if the House gets through with the pending bill in time to-day omnibus pension bills be taken up. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, there is no particular hurry about passing these pension bills. The House has passed a number of such bills that have gone away from here, and we have not seen anything of them since, and for the present I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. To ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee demands the regular order. The regular order is that the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9414.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-five Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Fairchild, G. W.	LaGuardia	Ramsey
Aswell	Farr	Lenroot	Rowland
Baer	Fess	Littlepage	Sanford
Blackmon	Flood	McCormick	Schall
Bland	Focht	McKeown	Scott, Pa.
Carlin	Fordney	Mann	Scully
Chandler, Okla.	Garland	Meeker	Siemp
Crago	Gordon	Nelson	Smith, T. F.
Curry, Cal.	Heintz	Norton	Stephens, Nebr.
Davis	Hollingsworth	Olney	Talbot
Dempsey	Huddleston	Overmyer	Temple
Dies	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker, N. J.	Van Dyke
Drukker	Kehoe	Parker, N. Y.	Walker
Eagle	Kinkaid	Powers	Wilson, La.
Estopinal	Kreider	Ragsdale	

The SPEAKER. On this call 369 Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. KITCHIN. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

INCREASED PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

Under the rule the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes, with Mr. CARAWAY in the chair.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire whether the bill is to be considered by sections or by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. By sections.

Mr. MADDEN. So that a whole section will have to be read before an amendment will be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read by paragraphs for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the bill be read by paragraphs for amendment, instead of by sections. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

That carriers in the Rural Free Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum and \$24 per mile per annum for each additional mile over 24 miles.

That after the passage of this act clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall be divided into six grades, as follows: First grade, salary \$1,000; second grade, salary \$1,100; third grade, salary \$1,200; fourth grade, salary \$1,300; fifth grade, salary \$1,400; sixth grade, salary \$1,500. Clerks and carriers shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade.

That hereafter the salaries of railway postal clerks shall be graded as follows: Grade 1 at \$1,100; grade 2 at \$1,200; grade 3 at \$1,300; grade 4 at \$1,400; grade 5 at \$1,500; grade 6 at \$1,600; grade 7 at \$1,700; grade 8 at \$1,800; grade 9 at \$1,900; grade 10 at \$2,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MADDEN: On page 1, line 3, strike out all after the word "that" up to and including the word "follows" in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Hereafter the compensation of postal employees shall be as follows."

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Under the ruling of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] while presiding over the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when the urgent deficiency bill was under consideration, when it was sought to add increased compensation for the department employees and for Government employees in all branches of the service outside of the Postal Service, he held that it would be in order to strike out, but that it would not be in order to add to a section

similar to this. I maintain that under the ruling of the gentleman from Virginia the point of order is not good.

The proposition contained in the amendment which I suggest makes this law permanent rather than for the period of the war. I suggest to the Chair that it is perfectly in order to entertain an amendment of this character, and that the point of order of the gentleman from Wisconsin should not be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] desire to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I merely reserved the point of order. I thought the gentleman wished me to reserve it so that he could discuss the merits of his proposition.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman from Wisconsin can discuss the point of order if he desires.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it is the purpose of the committee to make this bill permanent law for all time, to fix these salaries for the future, I have no objection. I understood that the purpose of the bill was to provide temporary relief for postal employees on account of conditions caused by the war. If it is the purpose of the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee to bring in an amendment increasing the salaries of all the postal employees for all time, why of course I am not going to obstruct it by a point of order, which I consider would be well taken on the ground that it is not germane.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman from Wisconsin need have no apprehension on this question. There is no collusion between the members of the committee about it. The committee were of the opinion that this bill should be temporary in its character. It is purely an emergency proposition. The conditions existing now may not exist a year from now, or when the war is ended, and it is not our purpose to fix these salaries permanently, but to meet the present conditions. I am very glad to have the gentleman make the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not going to make the point of order.

Mr. MOON. I will make the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I only wished to obtain the opinion of the chairman of the committee on the merits. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MOON. I make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think the point of order is well taken and sustains it.

Mr. MADDEN. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair be sustained?

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. Cox) there were—ayes 89, noes 134.

Accordingly the decision of the Chair was overruled.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CLAYPOOL. I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio rose too late. The gentleman from Illinois had been recognized.

Mr. COX. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COX. Is this the proper time to offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois?

The CHAIRMAN. When the gentleman from Illinois has used his time, then the gentleman from Indiana will be recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of the justice of the amendment which I have offered I wish to quote no less a personage than the President of the United States. In a communication to the democracy of New Jersey at a banquet held there on the 20th instant, the President of the United States sent a letter of felicitation, in the course of which he said that new conditions are upon us, that old times no longer exist, that old conditions can no longer prevail, and that men must deal with questions hereafter on the basis of justice. In the time allotted to me for the discussion of this amendment I propose to read the last paragraph of the letter of President Wilson to the Democrats of New Jersey, and I wish to apply his advice to the members of the Democratic Party on the floor of this House. The President said:

Let the Democratic Party in New Jersey therefore forget everything but the new service which they are to be called upon to render. The days of political and economic reconstruction which are ahead of us no man can now definitely assess, but we know this, that every program must be shot through and through with utter disinterestedness, that no party must try to serve itself, but every party must try to serve humanity, and that the task is a very practical one, meaning that every program, every measure in every program, must be tested by this question, and this question only: Is it just, is it for the benefit of the

average man, without influence or privilege; does it embody in real fact the highest conception of social justice and of right dealing, without respect of person or class or particular interest? This is a high test—

Says the President—

It can be met only by those who have genuine sympathy with the mass of men and real insight into their needs and opportunities and a purpose which is purged alike of selfish and of partisan intention. The party which rises to meet this test will receive the support of the people, because it deserves it.

Very sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

These are the words of the President of the United States. They apply as well to the measure now before this House as they apply to the occasion that is past, or the future, and I appeal to you men on the Democratic side of this House to follow the words of the President of the United States in dealing with this question that has for its purpose the dealing out justice to a class of men who by their service are entitled to the favorable consideration of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "for and" in line 3, page 1, and strike out all of line 3 after the word "the," and all of line 4 down to and including the word "President," and insert the following: After the word "the" in line 3, "fiscal year, 1919."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the subject matter of the amendment, which is said to be an amendment to my amendment, is not germane to my amendment and has no relation whatever to it. It is not an amendment to the amendment at all.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Illinois seeks to amend the paragraph 1 of section 1 by striking out certain language in the paragraph and inserting certain language. Now, granting that the gentleman's amendment is germane to the subject matter, then my amendment, which seeks to amend the same identical paragraph to which his amendment applies, is certainly germane.

Mr. REAVIS. Is not the gentleman's amendment an amendment to the bill rather than to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. COX. No; I think it applies directly to his amendment.

Mr. REAVIS. It might be a substitute, but it is not an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the Chair's attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is a motion to strike out a part of the language of the bill that is also included in the motion to strike out by the gentleman from Illinois. For that reason it can not be considered at this time. His motion is not to strike out a part of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, but a motion to strike out a part of the language that is included in the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois to strike out and insert. Of course, the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is proper for consideration and can be considered after this is disposed of, but it is not an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Iowa answers his own argument when he says that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is a motion to strike out a part of paragraph 1, section 1. My amendment strikes out some of the same language that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois strikes out. He moves to strike out and insert and I move to strike out and insert. I strike out a part of the same language that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois strikes out.

Mr. TOWNER. That is true, but the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is not to strike out a part of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois or change it.

Mr. COX. Both strike out the same language.

Mr. TOWNER. That is very true, and so it is an amendment to the bill and not an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is not an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, but a substitute.

Mr. COX. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer it as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold that in order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, let us have the amendment again reported.

Without objection, the amendment was again reported.

Mr. COX. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I hope no one here will get the idea that I am opposed to a reasonable increase for the postal employees. The paragraph in the bill as reported by the committee provides that this shall be an increase until 90 days after the close of the war. The

amendment of the gentleman from Illinois proposes to make it permanent law. The substitute which I have offered only provides for an increase for the fiscal year of 1919.

Now, gentlemen, in all candor, in all seriousness, I do not believe that we ought to make fish of one and fowl of another of the Government employees. This House last week passed a measure appropriating \$29,000,000 for the increased pay of various clerks of the various executive departments and branches of the Government, but it was for only one year, for the year 1919. Now, how in the world can we justify ourselves in voting to increase their salaries only for one year and voting here to permanently increase the salary of the postal employees of the United States? I put it to every Member here whether or not it is fair or unfair. There is bound to come a day of retribution and reckoning in this country. Of that there is no question on earth. This bill is carrying an appropriation of between thirty and thirty-two million dollars. I am wondering day by day, night by night, where the money is coming from to pay these enormous expenditures that are now being imposed upon us as a result of this war.

The salaries sought to be increased may not be too high. I feel sure of one proposition, and that is that they are not too high as to the rural carriers. I have full confidence on that proposition. What we ought to do is to increase the salary of all postal employees this year, because we can not tell whether the war is going to break up in the year 1919 or not. If it does, the high cost of living on which all of these increases are bottomed will fall out of the argument, because prices are bound to come down, and I want to ask you gentlemen if you would be willing to vote these increases of salary to these postal employees under conditions that obtained a few years ago, when the cost of living was so low? Is it not in the interest of the Treasury of the United States that we conserve our resources and only increase the salary for a period of one year, and at the end of that time, if the same conditions exist, it will be an easy matter to increase their compensation for the next year.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. For a question.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Has the gentleman noticed that on page 2, line 1, with reference to the delivery service and others, it is permanent law?

Mr. COX. If it is enacted in that form, it will become permanent law. I am against that, and I am only trying to get before the committee that what we ought to do is not to make permanent law, but to increase salaries for the fiscal year 1919, awaiting conditions at the close of that time. If present conditions continue, then it is no trouble for the House to offer a provision such as this that I have offered to you this morning; and if my amendment prevails, I intend to follow it up and move to strike out the provisions that proposed to make the remainder of this permanent law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, it is with much regret that I heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] make this motion. There was much difference of opinion about whether there ought to be any bill here at all with reference to these postal employees, but there was a general compromise of that question, and I was struck with utter astonishment when the gentleman from Illinois assumed a position against the committee in this matter. The second part of this section carries more money than any other part of it—that with reference to the clerks—and perhaps it may be permanent law. I know a number of gentlemen have yielded their judgment on this matter out of deference to the gentleman from Illinois, and therefore I can not refrain from the expression of a profound surprise at his rebellion against the committee on this bill. The purpose of this legislation is to meet a temporary emergency—the increase in the cost of living that has arisen since the war and that arose before the war as the result of public conditions. We do not expect that condition to last for all time. This is not a period in which salaries should be made permanent, but they may with propriety be raised to the per cent indicated in the bill in deference to the existing conditions. It is alone an emergency measure. It is not intended as a permanent measure. In normal times, when the necessities of life were as low as they were a few years ago, the salary of \$1,200 was entirely sufficient, and the salaries of the other clerks were sufficient. We are raising them now in order to meet unexpected conditions, and I think it is a very unwise thing to undertake to legislate permanently at this time. The committee all thought so. There was no dissent there. This bill was reported unanimously. Whatever the differences may have been on sections

of the bill between Members during its discussion and pendency, they come out on this question unanimously.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. While that is true, I would ask the gentleman if there was not some discussion in the committee when the consideration of the bill was finished at which it was announced, I think by the chairman of the committee, that every member of the committee would be at liberty to propose an amendment to any part of the bill?

Mr. MOON. Of course. Every member of the committee is at liberty legally to do that without any announcement by the chairman or anyone else; and I am not questioning the right to do it, but was just questioning the propriety among gentlemen on account of our implied agreement. Passing from that proposition, I want to say that it would be very unwise for us to attempt now to make permanent legislation as to postal employees, when just a day or two ago we passed a bill that made the legislation temporary as to the department employees, in every department of the Government, including the Postal Department. What a senseless position it would put this House in to go before the country with a bill already passed that provides an increase temporarily for the department clerks of the Post Office Department and a permanent raise for the field service! It would simply make a lot of idiots of you before the public, and that is just what you would be if you did it.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. RUBEY. I notice on page 2, in the second paragraph, it says—

That hereafter the salaries of railway postal clerks shall be graded as follows.

Is not that permanent law?

Mr. MOON. It possibly may be permanent law, but the railway mail clerks' section is a section that we will deal with when we reach it.

Mr. RUBEY. In the first paragraph, on page 2, I find the language:

That after the passage of this act clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall be divided into six grades, as follows.

Is not that permanent law?

Mr. MOON. I think that the section of the bill that makes the bill applicable during the war is the controlling section, and when all the others are applied to it they are all made temporary.

Mr. RUBEY. With all due deference to the gentleman, I believe we are fixing it to be permanent law as to these others and making the rural-carriers' provision temporary.

Mr. MOON. I do not care what the gentleman believes about it; I am merely expressing my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two or three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I have made these observations as chairman of the committee. It is utterly immaterial to me personally what you do about it. I do not want to be placed in the position of having supported in the House a bill that gives to the departmental clerks of the Post Office Department a temporary increase in salary and then on the next day come in and give the field men in the service a compensation that is permanent in its character.

It looks like a lot of school children instead of sensible men handling the question; that is all. I want to say another thing. You want this legislation. If you undertake to make this permanent, I question very much whether you get any of it or not.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman oppose the amendment? I believe the gentleman is a member of the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not now a member of the committee.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am going to risk the propriety of differing with the opinion of the members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in voting to strike out this amendment and voting against the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana. There was a difference of opinion, and there is still a difference of opinion, among the members of the Committee on the Post Office

and Post Roads as to whether or not this should be permanent legislation. I for one, Mr. Chairman, believe that the time has come when the employees of this department should have their cause pleaded on the floor of this House and that they should come into that which belongs to them, justice at the hands of this Congress. [Applause.] To-day there are no employees of the Government of the United States who have so little opportunity to come before the Congress and ask for justice as have the employees of this department. Every time they voice their opinion as to what they want they are immediately met by an autocratic power that takes away from them in defiance of law their right to appeal to the Congress of the United States. It is nothing new that this legislation should come before this body. For three years since I have been on the committee the appeal has been made to the committee to give the employees of this service a raise in their wages, and each year it has been voted down. Now, what are the conditions here? Last year we voted to give the employees of the Government a raise in their wages of 10 per cent, but by a decree handed down the employees of the Postal Service were deprived of the opportunity of receiving the 10 per cent raise. That is the reason the first section of this bill was made to read "that for and during the time of the war," so that we could go back and do justice to the men in the Post Office Service.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. I will.

Mr. REAVIS. Who is it who repeals the acts of Congress?

Mr. TAGUE. Oh, there is but one power to repeal an act of Congress, and that is the Postmaster General, and as he pleases. [Laughter.] The words "for and during the time of the war" are put in the bill for the explicit purpose of dealing and treating fairly with these employees, and when this bill was before the committee it was directed that all employees of the service should receive this compensation. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, without breaching the confidence of the committee, that when the question came as to making this permanent legislation the vote was decided by one vote, by a vote of 9 to 9. So, Mr. Chairman, you can see that the members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads believe it should be permanent legislation. And why not permanent legislation? Here are employees giving service to the Government in a capacity unlike that of any other called for by the Government, unable to advance after they enter the service of the Government, and they can never get beyond the amount of money and salary stated in law. They can not enter any other branch of the service, either, unless they resign from the Post Office Department.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. TAGUE. I will.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I observe in the latter part of the same section the rural carriers as well as the city carriers are divided into classes and a limit fixed for each class. The bill does not state, so I assume it is intended to leave their graduation into the classes entirely to the Postmaster General, and from what the gentleman has just said, would it be too much to assume that perhaps he would keep men down to the low classes with a low salary when he made up the increased pay, instead of letting them go up into the higher classes and receive the higher salary?

Mr. TAGUE. It is automatic promotion each year.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is that fixed by law?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes. Now, Mr. Chairman, I dislike to differ with the members of my committee on this subject, but I have differed with them before on things which I thought should be corrected. I believe the time has come in this country when we are being called upon to spend billions of dollars and every branch of labor in the country is receiving advance in wage, not of 15 per cent, not of 10 per cent, but of 40 and 50 per cent, with the cost of the necessities of life going higher, to raise the wages of the employees of this department in fair proportion to the advance given to private employment all over the country. I believe this can and should be done with the passage of this bill and by making it permanent legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close upon this amendment in five minutes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate close on this amendment in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not put the request for unanimous consent. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate has already been exhausted under the rule on the Madden amendment and it must be voted upon.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman permit an observation? There are many of us who desired to speak yesterday but the time was almost wholly consumed by gentlemen of the committee. I ask if the gentleman will not withhold his request?

Mr. MOON. I am willing to give any sort of time we have under the rule, but I do not propose that gentlemen shall override me under the rule. You have the right to have more time on the Cox amendment, and I do not object to more time being taken on this amendment but I just wanted to assert the rights of the committee under the rule. I ask unanimous consent that all debate be concluded upon the amendment that has been made to this section in 20 minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman ask unanimous consent or make a motion?

Mr. MOON. I am going to make a motion if I do not get consent.

Mr. TOWNER. I think that probably we can reach an agreement that will be fair. I think the gentleman understands that there are a great many Members who did not have an opportunity of speaking yesterday on the bill. I think most of those would be satisfied with five minutes. I did not take any time yesterday myself in general debate, and I would like five minutes.

Mr. MOON. I have no objection to the gentleman having time. This section contains not only this provision as to the time in which the bill shall run, but it contains the amount to be paid to the rural carriers and it contains the automatic promotion of clerks and carriers. Now, in order that everybody may be accommodated as to the matter, I move that the debate close upon the whole of this section, with all amendments thereto, within one hour from now.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope that motion will not prevail, Mr. Chairman. I wish to see if we can reach an agreement.

Mr. DYER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in one hour.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. This is not a matter of unanimous consent. This is a motion. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon].

The question was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. In the judgment of the Chair, the yeas seem to have it.

Mr. COX. A division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to stand here and enforce the rules of this House.

Mr. COX. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] demands a division. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon].

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 94, yeas 125.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] demand tellers?

Mr. MOON. No; I do not care anything about it. However, I want the gentleman to understand when he offers an amendment to strike out the last word he has got to talk on the subject of striking out the last word, and nothing else.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOON. How is the gentleman recognized?

Mr. DOWELL. In opposition to the substitute.

Mr. MOON. I make the point of order that debate is exhausted on the original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order that debate is exhausted in this amendment.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the committee, but I have an amendment.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ from the Chair. I was recognized, and it was so stated by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the Chair recognized the gentleman for the purpose of striking out the last word. Is that the motion?

Mr. DOWELL. That was my motion. I want to say just a few words at this time, and I want to call the attention of this committee—

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman has not said what the last word was that he was going to strike out.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee is out of order.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the Chair permit me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this amendment has expired, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment by way of substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we ought to have a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 182, noes 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I want to offer.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the amendment I suggested necessitates another one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is recognized. He is a member of the committee.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Strike out, on page 2, beginning with line 1, the balance of the section down to section 2 on line 14, and in lieu of the matter stricken out insert the following language:

"That clerks in the first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum, and 10 per cent per annum where their salaries are in excess of \$1,200 but not in excess of \$1,800 per annum."

"The railway postal clerks shall receive an increase of 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum and 10 per cent where their salaries are in excess of \$1,200 but not in excess of \$1,800 per annum: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall authorize the Postmaster General to discontinue promotions of clerks in first and second class post offices or carriers in City Delivery Service or railway postal clerks from grade to grade under the provisions of the classification acts fixing the compensation of those employees in these branches of the Postal Service."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out the so-called Madden reclassification plan and insert the same percentage increase on these particular classes of employees as is provided for the other class of postal employees. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes and present an intelligible statement.

Mr. MOON. Reserving the right to object, I want to suggest that this is quite an important amendment. Now, there will be other amendments offered. A good many gentlemen will want to discuss the matter, and I ask unanimous consent that every gentleman who desires to offer an amendment to this section offer it now, and that the debate on the whole section close in one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] asks unanimous consent that all amendments to be offered to this section be offered now, and that the debate on the same close in one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, who will control that time?

Mr. MOON. I will amend my suggestion by further asking that the Chair control the time, and let the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] have 20 minutes if he desires.

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, I fear that if all the amendments are pending at once, when we come to vote nobody will know what the amendment is, nobody will know just exactly what he is voting on, and so I prefer to see the amendments acted on upon their merits after proper discussion is had upon them, and let them all be disposed of in that way, instead of all being pending at once.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make a further suggestion. I made the proposition because I wanted to give all the time we could to gentlemen who have amendments, and have the discussion as lengthy as they want it; but if they do not want it, I will try to see that the rule is enforced.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to make this counter suggestion to the gentleman—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, consent for that has not been given.

Mr. BLACK. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would not object under any other conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will not object.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I agree to all that has been said in praise of that great body of employees who compose the personnel of the Postal Service. They are undoubtedly an efficient, hard working, and loyal body of workers, and deserve the good things which have been said about them during this debate.

I agree that these employees should have an increase in their compensation, and such has been my emphatic position, both in the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and here in the House.

I believe that whatever increases that are made should be just and liberal in amount and fair, both to the employees of the Postal Service and to the people of the United States, who furnish the revenue to maintain and sustain the Post Office Department. And I believe further that whatever law is passed on this subject should not extend for a longer period than the duration of the war and a reasonable time thereafter.

In my opinion now is no time to undertake to provide for permanent increases in the salaries of Government employees, because there is bound to come a period of readjustment after the war, the effect of which it would be impossible to judge with any degree of accuracy at the present time. No one knows and no one can tell what will be the size of the war debt owed by the United States when this great war shall have been brought to an end.

If we should pass a permanent law now providing for the reclassification of Government employees or should make these percentage increases permanent, then we Members of Congress have had experience enough to know that it will be well-nigh impossible to reduce the salaries, even though the revenues of the Post Office Department and the Government should imperatively demand it and living conditions should justify it after the war is over. Congress should not permit any class of Government employees, postal employees or otherwise, to take advantage of the abnormal conditions which now prevail as an excuse for permanent reclassification or permanent increase in pay. It would be unwise to do so, and it would not be just and right to the taxpayers, who are going to be burdened with a weight of taxation never dreamed of before in this country. Gentlemen, we had just as well awake to some stern realities. The taxes are coming. They can not be avoided, and the taxpayer is going to demand his day in court, and he ought to have it, and the quicker he demands it the better it will be for the whole country. There is an urgent need this very hour for the spirit of economy to fasten itself upon this Congress and the executive departments of the Government, and make itself felt in the reduction of public expenditures wherever it may properly be done. When peace does come and we can take an inventory of our resources and our ability to pay and can approach these things from an ordinary and a normal basis, then it would be a good time to go into a consideration of the whole subject of reclassification of the salaries of Government employees, with a view of permanently raising the compensation of the employee who is receiving too little and lowering the salary of the one who is receiving too much. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that there is a substantial number of Government employees who are receiving too small pay, and, on the other hand, I feel quite as sure that there are some whose compensation is quite enough.

But, despite some inequalities which exist, we must realize that with so many problems immediately connected with the war pressing for attention, a just solution of this problem can not be successfully undertaken at the present time and must wait the coming of the day when the country is at peace again and conditions are more normal than at the present hour. Therefore percentage increases for the period of the war and a reasonable time thereafter are more feasible and proper, to my way of thinking, than an attempt at permanent legislation on the subject. Most of the bill which we are now taking up for consideration is framed upon that idea and understanding, and as to that much of the bill, if it is adhered to, I am in sympathy and accord and will give it my free and willing support; but there are some other provisions of the bill, to which I will presently advert, to

which I am emphatically opposed and will endeavor to amend so as to make these particular portions conform to the general intent and purpose of the measure and make it a well-rounded bill and fair to all alike.

Now, as to those provisions of the bill which increase the salaries of rural carriers 15 per cent per annum and increase the salaries of other miscellaneous postal employees, such as assistant postmasters, printers, watchmen, and so forth, to the extent of 15 per cent where their salaries are not in excess of \$1,200 and 10 per cent where the salaries exceed \$1,200 and do not exceed \$1,800, and which provide for increased compensation for postmasters at fourth-class offices, I intend to lend my support, but I dissent from that part of the bill which, instead of giving the postal clerks and carriers in first and second class offices and railway mail clerks the same percentage increases as are given to other postal employees, seeks to reclassify them and raise the salary of each grade \$200 per annum. The reclassification plan, if put into effect at the present time, would be making favorites of these particular classes of postal employees, to a more or less extent, and would therefore be an unjust discrimination against others who are just as worthy and efficient and whose work is fully as important to the Postal Service. Now, in order that Members of the House may understand what this proposed reclassification plan will do and the changes in compensation which it will bring about and the additional expenditure which it will fasten upon the revenues of the Postal Department I will mention some details of the present classification law and point out the changes that the passage of this bill as it now stands would accomplish.

Clerks and carriers in first and second class offices are now divided into five grades, and the compensation of each grade is as follows:

Second grade, salary \$800; third grade, salary \$900; fourth grade, salary \$1,000; fifth grade, salary \$1,100; sixth grade, salary \$1,200.

One of the paragraphs of the bill which we are now considering would reclassify these clerks and carriers at first and second class offices into six grades and would fix the compensation of the respective grades as follows:

That after the passage of this act clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall be divided into six grades, as follows: First grade, salary \$1,000; second grade, salary \$1,100; third grade, salary \$1,200; fourth grade, salary \$1,300; fifth grade, salary \$1,400; sixth grade, salary \$1,500. Clerks and carriers shall be promoted successively to sixth grade.

The railway mail clerks are now classified into 10 grades, with compensation fixed as follows:

GRADES OF RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

Grade 1, at not exceeding \$900; grade 2, at not exceeding \$1,000; grade 3, at not exceeding \$1,100; grade 4, at not exceeding \$1,200; grade 5, at not exceeding \$1,300; grade 6, at not exceeding \$1,400; grade 7, at not exceeding \$1,500; grade 8, at not exceeding \$1,600; grade 9, at not exceeding \$1,700; grade 10, at not exceeding \$1,800; chief clerks, at not exceeding \$2,000.

If this bill is passed in its present form and not amended by the amendment which I have offered, then they would be reclassified into 10 grades, and the compensation of each grade would be increased \$200 per annum, and would hereafter be as follows:

Grade 1, at \$1,100; grade 2, at \$1,200; grade 3, at \$1,300; grade 4, at \$1,400; grade 5, at \$1,500; grade 6, at \$1,600; grade 7, at \$1,700; grade 8, at \$1,800; grade 9, at \$1,900; grade 10, at \$2,000.

I have offered an amendment which, if adopted, will put all of these employees that are proposed to be reclassified on a percentage basis of increase and leave their classification just as is now provided by existing law. In other words, if a clerk or carrier is now receiving \$1,200 per annum—and there are about 44,000 of them who are actually receiving that much—then under my amendment they would receive an increase in salary of \$180 per annum. My amendment which I have offered reads as follows: Strike out, on page 2, beginning with line 1, the balance of the section down to section 2, and in lieu of the matter stricken out insert the following:

That clerks in the first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall receive an increase of 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum, and 10 per cent per annum where their salaries are in excess of \$1,200, but not in excess of \$1,800 per annum.

That railway postal clerks shall receive an increase of 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum, and 10 per cent per annum where their salaries are in excess of \$1,200 but not in excess of \$1,800 per annum: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall authorize the Postmaster General to discontinue promotion of clerks in first and second class post offices or carriers in City Delivery Service

or railway postal clerks from grade to grade under the provisions of the classification acts fixing the compensation of those employees in these branches of the Postal Service.

Now, the inquiry which will naturally arise at once in this connection is, What will be the difference in cost to the Government between the bill as it now stands and what it will be if the reclassification provisions are stricken out and my amendment is adopted? That is a fair inquiry, and I will be glad to give the House the information. But before I start in to give the figures I will frankly state that if my amendment is adopted, the cost for the first year will be more than would be the cost if the bill is adopted with its reclassification plan, provided, of course, that the bill is not loaded down with amendments before it passes.

But this reclassification plan, as proposed in the bill, is one of ascending costs, and will cost more the second year than the first, and more the third year than the second, and more the fourth year than the third, and would about reach the peak of costs in the fourth year of its operation. For instance, the officials of the Post Office Department say that the increased cost of the salaries of clerks and carriers alone in first and second class offices the first year under the classification plan will be about \$7,000,000, the second year it will be about \$14,000,000, the third year about \$21,000,000, and the fourth year about \$24,000,000, and after that will be about the same in cost each year, except as to increases which will result from the normal expansion of the Postal Service. But probably the whole thing will be best illustrated by a comparison in cost for four years, the fourth year being the year when the peak of increased costs will be reached under the reclassification plan as now proposed in this bill.

If my amendment is adopted and all of these employees are put on the 15 and 10 per cent increase in compensation, and the present automatic-promotion law retained, the additional cost of the first four years of salaries to be paid to postal employees over that which they would receive under present law without increases would be approximately as follows:

First year, total amount of increase.....	\$30,594,175
Second year, total amount of increase.....	31,838,150
Third year, total amount of increase.....	33,013,490
Fourth year, total amount of increase.....	34,263,490

Total cost of four years..... 129,709,305

If my amendment is not adopted and this bill is enacted as it now stands, and this permanent reclassification plan, with its ascending cost for four years, is retained in the bill, and no other increasing amendments are adopted, then the additional cost to the postal revenues over that which is now paid will be for the next four years approximately as follows:

First year, total amount of increase.....	\$25,686,195
Second year, total amount of increase.....	36,912,795
Third year, total amount of increase.....	48,338,795
Fourth year, total amount of increase.....	53,000,000

Total cost of four years..... 163,937,785

Therefore the difference in cost, even assuming that the war will go on and we will continue the percentage increases for a period of four years, would be the difference between—

\$163,937,785
129,709,305
34,228,480

I submit that \$34,228,480 is a good deal of money, and we should do some very mature thinking before we saddle that much additional expense on the Postal Service, and without being able to look ahead and see what the conditions will be; and if, happily, the war should end sooner than a period of four years—and we all believe that it will end sooner than that—and the cost of living should again reach normal standards, and Congress should find that it was not necessary to longer retain these percentage increases, then the saving of my amendment would be a great deal more than I have stated. But, even assuming that it will be necessary and proper to continue these percentage increases of 15 and 10 per cent for a period of four years, the difference in cost for that four years will be, as I have stated, more than \$34,000,000.

Undoubtedly some Members of the House, in listening to the speeches which some of the Members have made during the course of this debate, have gained the impression that a large number of the postal employees are in the lower grades and are receiving the smaller salaries, but that is a mistake. The most of them, by reason of the automatic promotion law now in existence, have already reached the higher grades, and would certainly receive a substantial increase in salary under the percentage basis which I have proposed, an increase which should be satisfactory, and I believe will be, to most of the employees.

Take the clerks in first and second class offices, for instance:

There are 1,977 in the \$800 grade. They would receive \$100 per annum increase by the automatic-promotion law and \$120 by my percentage amendment, making \$220 increase in all.

There are 2,000 in the \$900 grade. They would receive \$100 per annum increase by the automatic-promotion law and \$135 by my percentage amendment, making \$235 increase in all.

There are 3,300 in the \$1,000 grade. All of this grade of clerks in first-class post offices and 85 per cent of them in second-class offices would receive \$100 per annum increase by the automatic-promotion law, and all of them would receive \$150 by my percentage amendment.

There are 9,000 in the \$1,100 grade. Eighty-five per cent of this grade of clerks in first-class post offices would receive \$100 per annum increase by the automatic-promotion law, and all of them would receive \$165 increase by my percentage amendment.

There are 19,500 in the \$1,200 grade. All of these clerks would receive \$180 per annum increase under my percentage amendment.

Take the carriers in the first and second class offices as a further illustration:

There are 2,673 in the \$900 grade. They would receive \$100 per annum increase by the automatic-promotion law and \$135 by my percentage amendment, making \$235 increase in all.

There are 1,262 in the \$1,000 grade. All of this grade of carriers in first-class post offices and 85 per cent of them in second-class offices would receive \$100 per annum increase by the automatic-promotion law, and all of them would receive \$150 increase by my percentage amendment.

There are 5,237 in the \$1,100 grade. Eighty-five per cent of this grade of carriers in first-class post offices would receive \$100 per annum increase by the automatic-promotion law, and all of them would receive \$165 increase by my percentage amendment.

There are 23,696 in the \$1,200 grade. All of these carriers would receive \$180 per annum increase under my percentage amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Are these clerks and carriers promoted because of length of service?

Mr. BLACK. Under the law as it now stands they are automatically promoted from year to year in second-class offices up until the fourth grade, and in the first-class offices up until the fifth grade, and after that 85 per cent are promoted in the second-class offices up to the fifth grade, and 85 per cent in the first-class offices are promoted automatically to the sixth grade.

Mr. HASTINGS. Because of length of service?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I am sorry that I can not yield now, because I want to finish my statement and my time is limited.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I wanted to ask the gentleman something in reference to what he has said.

Mr. BLACK. Very well, I yield.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will wait until later.

Mr. BLACK. I wanted to use this further illustration in discussing my amendment. There are about 44,000 clerks and carriers in the Postal Service who are now receiving \$1,200. Under my amendment they will all receive 15 per cent increase in salary, which will be \$180 per annum increase, and this will make their salaries \$1,380 a year, and it seems to me that will be a substantial increase.

Members of the House would probably be interested to know what is the average salary received by postal clerks and letter carriers, and the latest figures that I have seen from the Post Office Department place the average annual salary of post-office clerks at \$1,081.33 and of letter carriers at \$1,114.35.

It is more than that now, because the general average has been raised since these figures were compiled, because of the normal effect of the automatic-promotion law.

The following table will show the figures for the railway postal clerks:

Average salary of railway postal clerks.

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Average salary.
1910	\$1,164
1911	1,170
1912	1,174
1912 (Sept. 30) (Reclassification act effective Oct. 1, 1912)	1,173
1913	1,239
1914	1,265
1915	1,329
1916	1,380
1917	1,414
1917 (Nov. 15)	1,433

It will be observed that the above figures show an increase in this average compensation of 23.1 per cent since 1910.

And in a statement which First Assistant Postmaster General J. C. Koons made to the Subcommittee on Post Offices and

Post Roads, while it was holding hearings on this subject, he said that since 1907, when the classification act for postal clerks and letter carriers was passed, that the average salary of post-office clerks has increased \$260 per annum, or 32.42 per cent, and the average salary of the city letter carrier has increased \$226.59, or 25.18 per cent. These increases result from the automatic promotions of clerks and carriers in the service from year to year and by reason of abolishing grade No. 1.

Now, the question arises, Are these increases enough under present abnormal conditions? And to that question I answer, "No."

I believe that percentage increases should be given as set out in the amendment which I have offered to help meet the higher cost of living which now prevails. If at the end of the fiscal year 1919 conditions should demand still further percentage increases, then I would be in favor of giving them; but I do not believe that we should go into a permanent reclassification of a portion of these employees at the present time, nor do I believe that we should make this bill permanent law as to the percentage increases in salaries. I have already given my reasons and I will not repeat them.

Undoubtedly a considerable number of Government employees do not expect us to adopt permanent reclassification at the present time.

In the February issue of the Federal Employee, the official magazine of the National Federation of Federal Employees, the following statement appears:

RECLASSIFICATION OF SALARIES AND POSITIONS.

It is not believed that Congress will take favorable action at this session on any bill providing for general reclassification of salaries and wages in any branch of the service. In all probability they will grant percentage increases and postpone action on general reclassification measures until the next session, when necessary information will be available on which to base such measures. The various local Federal employees' unions have been called on to submit information—statistics, recommendations, etc.—with regard to a general reclassification measure, so that the National Federation of Federal Employees at its next convention may adopt a specific measure and get the support of all branches of the service for one bill. If you have any ideas on this subject do not fail to send them in. All suggestions and plans will be considered.

CONCLUSION.

Now, I want to reiterate that I have the very highest esteem for the postal employees as a class of workers and the warmest praise for their service in the Post Office Department. If this bill is limited in its effect to the period of the war and for a reasonable time thereafter and carries reasonable percentage increases, I shall gladly support it. Otherwise I shall feel compelled from a sense of duty to vote against it. If only the postal employee was to be considered in a matter of this kind we might easily respond to almost any demand for salary increase which he might make, unless it was one which was over and beyond all limits of sense and reason, but it must be remembered that we have no postal revenues except what the people pay, and therefore in all good conscience a Representative must bear in mind their interests as well as those of the employee.

The amendment which I have offered, taken in connection with the other sections of the bill, will entail an expenditure of more than \$30,000,000 a year upon the postal revenues, and I submit that is as far as we ought to go under present conditions.

As a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I have given this subject considerable investigation, and what I have said represents my deliberate judgment, and I purpose to follow out this judgment in the further consideration of this bill, believing that in so doing I am discharging my duty to the postal employees as well as the people whom I have the honor to represent.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, is it not possible to arrange some time for the consideration of this most important paragraph? There will be various amendments offered. I think we ought to have an agreement as to the time.

Mr. MOON. I have done my best to get you gentlemen on the other side to agree to a limitation of debate, but you have refused to do it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; if the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. MOON. You went into the work of striking out some language that the chairman had used.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, the only objection that was made to the request by the gentleman from Tennessee as to the length of time for consideration of amendments to the paragraph was to that part which referred to

taking a vote on all of the amendments at the close. Now, there are a number of bona fide amendments to be offered to this important section.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman from Illinois, the most interested Member in this section, as I understood him, wanted the regular order and to proceed with the amendments in order.

Mr. MADDEN. As far as the vote on the amendments. I am willing to have time given to each amendment.

Mr. BLACK. This is an important subject, and I think we ought not to pass over it without due consideration.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I am not feeling very good this morning about these Republicans who voted on the proposition a while ago, but I am not going against them when they want to talk, for I know that nothing does them so much good as to get an opportunity to talk. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, by consent of all concerned, I want to say that, as far as I am concerned, I have three other amendments that I want to offer. They go to the section we have under discussion, and after that I have not any amendments to suggest. I would like to have the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], a member of the committee, given such time as he thinks he ought to have to discuss the pending amendment.

Mr. BLACK. I think it will not take over 15 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I would like to have, Mr. Chairman, an agreement as to the length of debate, and I want to ask the chairman of the committee if we can come to an agreement for 20 minutes debate on each of the three succeeding amendments, and then vote at the end of the 20 minutes' debate on each one?

Mr. FIELDS. Vote on all the amendments together?

Mr. MADDEN. No; on each amendment.

Mr. FIELDS. Would that preclude the offering of other amendments and debate upon them?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all.

Mr. MOON. What total length of time does the gentleman from Illinois suggest?

Mr. MADDEN. I would suggest an hour on the three amendments.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, I want to suggest that yesterday the debate practically was all consumed by members of the committee, and up to date to-day it has been the same. Some of us who really wanted to say something pertinent on the last amendment could not get a minute. I have no objection to the gentleman from Texas taking what time he wants, which I am advised he can use to advantage, but I do submit that it is not proper to give all the time to the members of the committee, and then have the chairman of the committee chop it off. If other Members can have something to say as well as the members of the committee I will not object.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is, is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

Mr. MADDEN was recognized.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I do not want the House to be tied down strictly to the rules of the House if it does not want to. I have no objection, personally, to any length of debate on this section or any other, nor do I care how the House votes in connection with this bill or any other bill. If you want to fix the time for debate I will not suggest it myself, but let other gentlemen suggest it, and I will make no objection to it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee, which to my mind greatly modifies the situation, I will withdraw my objection to the extension of time for the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MADDEN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the request of the gentleman from Texas to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, if the gentleman is permitted to go on for an additional time, will the opposition have the same amount of time?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in the power of the Chair to determine.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the fallacy of the argument of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is, to begin with, that he seeks to repeal the reclassification act entirely.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. My amendment provides that the automatic promotions shall not be suspended. It remains just the same.

Mr. MADDEN. It would, in effect, then, repeal the classification law passed in 1907 in the case of the clerks and carriers and in 1912 in the case of the railway postal clerks. There is no justice whatever in dealing with the men in this branch of the Postal Service on the basis of percentage in increase in their pay. They were not granted that increase last year when everybody else was. They were compelled to wait for further legislation. The legislation is now pending. It ought to be adopted. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] would destroy every future hope of every man engaged in the Postal Service, or those branches of the Postal Service to which his amendment applies.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. If the bill is passed as it is written, containing the gentleman's proposition, what would be the average increase of these postal employees?

Mr. MADDEN. The average increase would be about 15 per cent.

Mr. HAMLIN. And the increase on all the others is about what?

Mr. MADDEN. About 15 per cent.

Mr. HAMLIN. Fifteen and ten, is it not?

Mr. MADDEN. It ranges from 25 per cent down, according to the compensation they receive, so that it averages close to 15 per cent—about 16 per cent.

Mr. BLACK. How is it that it reaches such a peak of cost beyond the computation?

Mr. MADDEN. I presume that the men get into the higher grades after an average of service, and that, of course, increases the expenditure, whereas if they remain in the same class all the time and only receive 15 per cent increase in their pay it would cost more to increase them on the percentage plan to-day than the present plan costs, whereas it will cost more under the present plan in the years to come than it does under the percentage plan. These men, it may just as well be understood, have to serve on the average four years as substitutes. They earn on the average during the substitute period \$35 a month. It takes them five years after they are regularly appointed to reach the highest grade. That is nine years, and during all of the nine years they receive an average compensation under the present law of \$742.22.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that those classes who now get \$800 are raised to \$1,000 and those who get \$1,300 are raised to \$1,500?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think that will make an average of about 19 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it does not.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Eight to ten would be 25 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. And 13 to 15 would be 13 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman may have his figures, I have mine. I believe that the only just method of treating these men in the Railway Mail Service and in the Postal Service, for clerks and carriers, is under the classification act which it is proposed to reenact with a higher grade of salaries.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I want the information, because I follow the gentleman as near as I can about these matters; but what is the reason for making a different raise with these clerks than with the others?

Mr. MADDEN. There is no one else in the service that is classified except the men in the Postal Clerical Service, the Carrier Service, and the Railway Mail Service. All of the other men are working from month to month on the same standard day. These men are classified, justly so, because the hours demanded of them average 12 every day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I suppose a person who opposes this bill as I do, and who will vote for those propositions that relieve it as much as possible, as I shall do, and vote against it finally, as I shall do, had just as well undertake to stop the water from running over Niagara Falls. He had just as well try to beat back the tide of the ocean. I am not afraid to be in the minority when I know I am right. There is sufficient bait on this hook for every man in here to take under the hook, cork, sinker, and line. I have never seen, during the time that I have been serving in Congress, the membership as ravenous, absolutely ravenous and

clamoring for pork as they are on this proposition. Now, here we are in the middle of a tremendous war, gentlemen. Your Committee on Military Affairs will report a bill amounting to \$10,000,000,000. The Committee on Naval Affairs will report a bill of about \$1,300,000,000. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee authorized the issue of \$500,000,000 for the railroads. The Ways and Means Committee chartered a financial corporation of \$500,000,000 capital, and authorized the issuance of \$2,000,000,000 credit, all to be raised by sale of Government bonds. Summing it all up the appropriations this year will amount to about \$15,000,000,000. Is there one dollar that you will appropriate by this bill necessary for the conduct of this war? In other words, when the demands of this Government for the preservation of its very life are the very heaviest—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. No; I have only five minutes. When the demands of this Government are the very heaviest for the purpose of preserving the Republic, Congress, without hesitation, without hardly an opportunity for a man to oppose it, passes an appropriation that runs in its fourth year up to about \$60,000,000 for men who are now supported by the Government and who, in my opinion, if left alone and not agitated by men who are interested in stirring and agitating up matters of this kind, would be perfectly contented and willing to serve for the compensation they are now receiving.

When the shipbuilders strike, some men arise on this floor and denounce them. When the coal miners strike, these same men will get up here and say it is absolutely criminal, and every one of these disturbances have their incipency, their beginning, right here in the Congress of the United States. Agitation in such matters as this is simply the cue passed on down the line to these other men; they decide to strike and you say they are not good American citizens, they ought to be put in the penitentiary, that they ought to be punished; and I am not defending strikers; I am far from it; but I want to see the American Congress some time while this war is on awaken to the fact that it takes money to wage war, that the United States is the last solvent belligerent country engaged in this war, that we must not only finance our war, but we have got to loan the money to the other allies in order to buy munitions of war.

As a means of raising war revenue the postage on letters was increased from 2 to 3 cents, the price of every postal card was raised from 1 to 2 cents. If this bill passes, every cent of revenue that was raised by this increase in postage will go, not in part payment of the prosecution of the war, but to increase the salaries of Government clerks and carriers in whose interest this bill is brought forward.

War conditions are driving women and girls into the fields as farm laborers. In some sections of the country women are taking the place of men as section hands on the railroads. Under such circumstances and conditions the office-holding class ought to share rather than add to the burden of the taxpayer and wage earner.

The Washington newspapers, conscious or otherwise, are doing the country irreparable injury by the continued agitation for increase in salaries of Government clerks and employees. Many of the strikes throughout the country during this crisis are traceable directly to the propaganda carried on by the Washington papers to boost the salaries of the Government clerks and employees. Every labor organization in the country has its representatives here, who are watching every opportunity to press demands for like advances in wages for the members of the innumerable labor organizations scattered through the country. The eyes of not only the Republic, but of the world, are focused on Washington as a reservoir of patriotism and self-sacrifice, to the end that the Government may be administered in such a manner as to guarantee the successful prosecution of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent, with the consent of the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, if we can have, say, an hour's general discussion on section 1 of the bill and then let amendments be offered at the end of the discussion, so that each man will have a chance to say something on this section of the bill.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Wait until the Chair puts the request. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that there be one hour of discussion on section 1 and all amendments thereto—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no!

The CHAIRMAN. One moment.

Mr. MADDEN. I asked unanimous consent that there shall be one hour's debate on section 1 of the bill; that the discussion on the amendments to be offered to the bill later shall be confined to 10 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. Just wait a moment until the Chair states the question. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks unanimous consent that there shall be one hour of general discussion on section 1 and that at the expiration of that time amendments may be offered and there be 10 minutes debate on each amendment, after which the amendment shall be voted upon. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] was talking to me about the matter a while ago I authorized him to say to the gentleman from Illinois that, as far as I was concerned, there might be one hour further discussion upon this bill; but I did not mean at the end of that hour amendments could come in and be discussed for 10 minutes under the rule as it now exists. That would be simply giving an hour of general debate and then the regular time as authorized under the rule. I am willing that one hour be given to the discussion of the bill and that any amendment may be offered in that time that gentlemen desire to offer, and, at the end of the hour's debate, then the vote be taken on amendments without further discussion.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think there will be a good many amendments upon this first section of the bill; but I think if we can agree on an hour of general debate in connection with it and then agree that there shall be one speech of five minutes for and one of five minutes against each amendment we will get along pretty well.

Mr. MOON. Well, that is the rule now.

Mr. MADDEN. But we are not enforcing it.

Mr. MOON. You have been enforcing it on me.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no; we did not enforce anything on the gentleman.

Mr. MOON. I do not know how many amendments you are going to propose.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think there will be many amendments, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MOON. I do not like to have an hour's general debate and then a debate under the five-minute rule. I am not objecting to taking the hour in which time the amendments can be offered so that we can have a vote on the amendments at that time. I just want to save time and give opportunity for debate to gentlemen who desire to do so.

Mr. GILLET. This is a matter of interest to both sides which men would like to debate, and I think it is fair and reasonable that they should have an opportunity to debate it, as the gentleman undoubtedly agrees.

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman have any idea how many amendments there will be?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know. I have three amendments to offer—that is all I propose to offer.

Mr. COX. I have one amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, one amendment I propose to offer is one to perfect the section, due to the fact that the committee adopted one amendment and there should not be any objection to that amendment.

Mr. MOON. How would it satisfy the gentleman to take an hour for general debate and amendments, too?

Mr. MADDEN. Make the other half hour in connection with the amendments when they are pending, will you?

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I believe it would be utterly unfair to those who have amendments that they desire to offer in good faith to deny them the right to present their amendments and have them voted on at the conclusion of the debate on that amendment. I therefore object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] objects, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the Moon-Madden bill. It seems to me that we have waited long enough to do justice to a very large class of employees throughout the Government service whose faithfulness has been well established in every branch wherein this bill is applicable. As has been frequently stated on the floor, it is over 10 years since any adjustment has been made of salaries of postal employees, and no one will deny that during that period of time there has been a very marked increase in the cost of living. It is very essential that something should be done to retain the

personnel. I happen to know of numerous instances where men have become absolutely disgusted with Postal Service conditions and have resigned from positions where their service has been valuable to the Government, and accepted others in order to better their living conditions. We do not need to paint, Mr. Chairman, any pictures of conditions under which these men serve.

The rural carrier goes out over his line in winter and summer, in heat and cold, rain and snow. The railway mail postal clerk is continually exposed, both to danger and to the hardships of travel, requiring long absences from home. The city carrier is also obliged to face the inclemencies of the weather in his routine work. All of these men are serving at very moderate rates of compensation. In fact, there is no feature of the Postal Service that is appealing to men to enter it at the present time.

Certainly we can do justice to these men by these moderate increases. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] said yesterday, if any one of these men was in your or my employ and asked for an increase there would be no question of its being granted. Why does not that same rule apply to the thousands in the Government service? Why should we not do justice to them as well as to one individual employee? I do not agree with the attitude of the chairman of the committee that this is a war-emergency measure. The committee has acted wisely in striking out that feature of section 1 and incorporating a permanent basis of additional pay in the various postal lines of service. We have had in New England recently a good deal of complaint of the Postal Service. This has come, in large measure, from the fact that we have sapped the ambition of the men in all branches by the attitude of the department toward them and toward these increases in salary. I noticed only a few days ago that the Postmaster General made a statement whereby he showed that he was quite proud of the fact of the large surplus in the postal receipts. It strikes me that it is a bookkeeping surplus, pure and simple, but if there is a surplus let us put it to the right use. These men have helped earn that surplus by giving their best, by giving faithful service, and, therefore, it seems to me that we as representatives of the Government can do no better than to recognize that faithful service by granting such increases as are called for in this bill.

I have been in favor of this legislation since it was first brought forward, and have twice appeared before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, offering statistics and designating the organizations in my district that would be directly affected by these increases. I also have frequently stated my attitude to the men themselves and am very glad of this opportunity to add a further word in their behalf.

The requirements of their duties are very exacting, and they must be men of excellent habits and character to satisfactorily perform the duties demanded of them. They merit this recognition from the Government, and I hope that this bill will be speedily enacted into law.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], because I believe the committee, after having given due consideration to this bill, has reported a fair, just, and reasonable increase to the large number of deserving Government employees. With the amendment adopted on the floor of this House making the increase permanent, I believe we have a fair and just bill. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], in whom I have the utmost confidence, stated on the floor of this House a few moments ago that the first provision, namely, the provision for an increase of the rural free delivery, was a fair, just, and reasonable increase. And I want to assure him that if he is certain that that increase is a deserving, justifiable, fair, and reasonable increase for that branch of the service, it surely is reasonable when it applies to the clerks and letter carriers in the large cities, which are covered by the provision which is aimed to be amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. I have observed that the gentleman from Texas in his amendment is not endeavoring to amend the first provision of this bill, which applies to the Free Rural Service, and I am satisfied that if he were acquainted with the services that are rendered by the clerks as well as letter carriers in large cities he would not offer his amendment, and that he would not begrudge them the small increase which is provided for in this bill.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], as well as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM], know that the people in the large centers to-day are obliged to pay three times as much for cotton goods as they did two years or three years ago, and the gentlemen from the West know that we are obliged to pay much higher prices for wheat and for corn, and for other necessities of life. And in view of these tremendous increases that the people residing in the cities are obliged to pay for sus-

tenance and for the necessities of life, it is absolutely necessary that some step be taken by which these small salaries shall be increased so that they can maintain themselves and provide for their families.

I know, and, in fact, I am satisfied, if these gentlemen who oppose the increases on the part of some of the Government employees were familiar with the tremendously increased prices that the people are obliged to pay in the cities for the necessities of life, they would not hesitate for a moment to grant the small increase for the men that are earning less than \$1,500, \$1,800, or even \$2,000.

That the price of necessities of life has steadily increased is conceded and known to all. In many instances food has increased from 50 to 100 per cent, and, due to the high cost of cotton, wool, and leather, not only clothing, shoes, women's and children's dress, but all articles needed and required have tremendously increased in price. Shoes have increased 100 per cent, woolen goods 100 per cent, and cotton goods from 150 to 300 per cent. In view of these unjustifiable high prices that the people are obliged to pay for these articles, it is the duty of the Government to increase the salaries and wages of its employees, as it is the duty of all other employers.

The reasonable increases that are provided for in this bill, which I believe has been carefully prepared, and which, as I stated before on the floor of the House, with the amendment adopted makes it a bill that each and every Member should vote for, and the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] should not prevail.

Mr. Chairman, due to the low salaries paid to the actually overworked post-office employees many of them have been obliged to seek other employments so as to be able to make both ends meet. In that way the department has lost many good and experienced men. In addition a great number of these patriotic employees have entered the military and naval service of the United States and consequently the Post Office Department is handicapped.

Only a short time ago my attention was called to a notice which the collector of water rents is sending out to thousands of Chicagoans with the bills, which I herewith insert:

SAVE YOUR DISCOUNT.

Unavoidable delays in handling and delivering the mails are occurring and will increase, due to shortage of help, occasioned by skilled post-office employees gone and going to war.

Many discounts will be lost, due to such delays, unless you mail remittances covering water bills at least five days before expiration of discount periods.

Therefore please remit early and save your discount.

Approved:

W. J. McCourt,
Superintendent of Water, Chicago, Ill.

And I also submit a communication received in connection with this notice which will bear out the statements made by me:

The reason assigned by the city collector is only partially correct. It is true that some of these men have been drafted, but by far the greater number have left to seek more attractive employment elsewhere. Owing to the meager wage, excessive overtime, and unnecessary night work the Chicago post office can not keep its force recruited up to the proper strength.

It has been stated that the delays in handling the mail are due to the Railway Mail Service. In this connection please observe that these statements sent out by the superintendent of water do not require any handling by the Railway Mail Service. It is local delivery pure and simple, and the delays are caused by the shortage of help and the breakdown in the spirit of the men in the Chicago post office.

E. J.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MOON. Has not the debate already been exhausted on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It has.

Mr. BLACK. I call for a vote, then, on the amendment.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, if the debate is exhausted on this section, we ought to have a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has an amendment he desires to offer.

Mr. MOON. An amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. To strike out the last word.

Mr. MOON. Which is really a pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has been recognized.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was recognized before the parliamentary inquiry was made.

Mr. MOON. I do not want to cut the gentleman off from his speech at all. I want to come to a vote as soon as we can.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I regret that my voice is not strong enough to-day to reach all of you, but I shall strive to make it do so. I feel deeply on this subject. During the five years I have been in Congress I have devoted myself largely to the betterment of the Post Office Service. I saw service 24 years ago under the Cleveland and McKinley administrations as postmaster. I made a study of the post-office question at that time. I have always taken a deep interest since.

I want to say to you, gentlemen, that the men who were drawing \$1,200 a year 20 years ago are getting \$1,200 to-day, with no prospect of a raise. I am talking about the carriers of the country. One thousand two hundred dollars was the limit. They say to you that you ought to put them on a par with men who have been getting \$1,500 or \$1,800, or have a prospect of a raise such as the department clerks have in considering a percentage of increase in pay.

We have attempted to reclassify the clerks and carriers so that they may in time have a raise to \$1,500 salary. One thousand five hundred dollars now is not half as much as \$1,200 was 20 years ago, when the carriers and the clerks got \$1,200.

It is a condition, not a theory, that confronts us. In all the cities of this country we find the best men in the service getting out because they can get more money elsewhere. The men who have passed the prime of their usefulness stay. The men who can not earn more than \$1,200 stay, but the men—and there are thousands of them—who can earn more than \$1,200 are getting out of the service, because for over 20 years they have seen nothing done to keep their salaries up with the rising cost of living.

We want to keep up the morale of the force. We want to fix it so that it is not required in all the big cities of the country to go out into the country seeking carriers because the people of the city know that the cost of living is so much higher than the salaries received that they will not apply for these positions.

Take, for instance, the city of Detroit. In three months 100 of their carriers resigned. The postmaster of the city of Detroit is writing out to the postmasters all over the State of Michigan asking them to send in men who could act as carriers, because they can not get them in Detroit. What is the result? The service is being demoralized, because men unfamiliar with the work, men unfamiliar with the cities, are forced to take the places of the best men in the service, who have to get out in order to make a decent living for their families. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this amendment has expired. Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, may we not have that amendment reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Strike out, on page 2, beginning with line 1, the balance of the section down to section 2, on line 14, and in lieu of the matter stricken out insert the following language:

"That clerks in the first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum, and 10 per cent per annum where their salaries are in excess of \$1,200 but not in excess of \$1,800 per annum.

"The railway postal clerks shall receive an increase of 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum, and 10 per cent per annum where their salaries are in excess of \$1,200 but not in excess of \$1,800 per annum: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall authorize the Postmaster General to discontinue promotion of clerks in first and second class post offices or carriers in City Delivery Service or railway postal clerks from grade to grade under the provisions of the classification acts fixing the compensation of those employees in these branches of the Postal Service."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the Black amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLACK. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 18, noes 110.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I wish to offer.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Ohio a member of the committee?

Mr. CROSSER. No.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have a right to offer the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Has anybody any rights here except the members of the committee?

Mr. MADDEN. I think we have preferential right on the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized to offer an amendment. The Clerk will report his amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 1, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Each carrier in the Rural Free Delivery Service now receiving a compensation of \$1,200 or less shall receive in addition thereto 15 per cent of the amount of such compensation and \$24 per mile per annum for each mile by which his route shall exceed in length 24 miles."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say, in connection with this amendment that it becomes necessary to perfect the language of that paragraph on account of having adopted the amendment in the first paragraph of the bill making the language of the bill permanent. It simply provides a change in the language to correspond with the permanent language of the law, and makes clear exactly what is meant by the compensation to be allowed to the carriers in the Rural Delivery Service. It makes no change whatever in the purpose of the paragraph as proposed by the committee, but simply clears up the doubt that might exist on account of having adopted the first amendment which I offered.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, the present scale of pay of rural free carriers for routes in excess of 24 miles and up to 30 miles is \$1,200.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry—

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can not take me off the floor by a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MOON. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is right about that. Go ahead.

Mr. STAFFORD. Unless the gentleman really wishes to make an inquiry in all good faith—

Mr. MOON. That is all right. I will make an inquiry that will be in good faith, but I will await the gentleman's pleasure.

Mr. STAFFORD. The rural carriers on routes above 30 miles up to 36 miles get an additional \$24 for each mile or major portion of a mile above 30 miles. Is that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. They get additional pay for each mile over 30 miles.

Mr. STAFFORD. Therefore, under the amendment proposed by the gentleman a carrier who travels 30 miles will be getting \$1,344, while a carrier who has a route 31 miles long will be getting \$1,372, a much greater increase than the carriers on the shorter-distance routes will receive.

Mr. MADDEN. No; I think the gentleman does not understand the language.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the language very thoroughly.

Mr. MADDEN. Here is what happens to-day: The compensation of a carrier who has a 24-mile route is \$1,200 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Up to 30 miles.

Mr. MADDEN. Up to 30 miles. Now, additional compensation for any mile over 30 miles is not considered a part of the salary. Under this amendment we propose to continue that. We propose to pay 15 per cent additional on the \$1,200 received, and then \$24 a mile for each additional mile above 24, no matter how many miles it may be, so that, when a man gets the compensation provided for in this section of the bill, for a 24-mile route he will receive \$1,380; for a 30-mile route, he would receive \$1,524; for a 31-mile route, under this provision of the bill, he would receive \$1,548; and for a 32-mile route he would receive \$1,560, and so on.

Mr. STAFFORD. I admit that I do not understand the gentleman's amendment if the salaries to be paid to rural carriers on the routes stated by the gentleman from Illinois will increase the compensation \$300 or more.

Mr. MADDEN. That is exactly what it does. Now I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman's amendment, as I caught it, or as I comprehended his statement about it, was merely a consequential amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. That was all. Simply to clear up—

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It was intended to provide that the increased compensation that these rural carriers should receive would be permanent.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Having in mind that in the preceding paragraph you have already provided for the permanence of compensation of all postal employees—and rural carriers certainly are postal employees—what is the necessity for this consequential amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. The language of the paragraph if it were not amended would read like this:

That carriers in the Rural Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum, and \$24 per mile per annum for each additional mile over 24 miles.

That would be on the theory that it was for and during the period of the war and 90 days thereafter.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. But you have stricken that out.

Mr. MADDEN. We have stricken that out. Hence it was necessary to modify the language of the succeeding paragraph.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What I wanted to point out was this: I do not think this is needed at all—

Mr. MADDEN. I think it is, because you have already provided in the preceding paragraphs that these postal employees, all of them, shall receive this advanced compensation as a matter of permanent law. It certainly does not hurt it to put in this language.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois if there are any rural carriers now getting over \$1,200 a year?

Mr. MADDEN. There may be cases where they do on some of these motorized routes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to get some additional information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If it is true that none are receiving over \$1,200 a year, why the necessity of having that language in the bill at all? In other words, would the gentleman have any objection to striking from his amendment the words "now receiving a compensation of \$1,200 or less"?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I have not the slightest objection to having the language so modified as to meet the views of gentlemen who know more about the rural carrier service than I do. The only purpose I have in mind is to see that the rural carrier service is properly protected on account of the amendment first adopted. I do not know whether the language of the amendment is going to meet the case or not, and I would prefer to have the matter referred to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL], who has given this matter consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I would suggest that the gentleman from Florida confer with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL], who has been giving consideration to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to be recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit me to offer an amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order yet. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have been recognized, and I decline to yield for a parliamentary inquiry. The amendment as reported by the committee and also the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] works an injustice to a large number of rural carriers. Under the existing law rural carriers receive a maximum of \$1,200 for a route 24 miles in length, extending up to 30 miles, and \$24 additional on routes in excess of 30 miles for each mile or major fraction thereof above 30 miles. The proposal reported by the committee provides for giving \$24 in addition to the 15 per cent to all carriers on routes of 24 miles up to 30 miles.

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what the paragraph says. Let me read the language as reported by the committee. This is a composite bill, the most awkwardly phrased and unworkable bill that I have ever seen presented by any committee of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. That is because we did not have any geniuses on the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Because it was thrown into the House one afternoon without being first put into the basket and given careful consideration by the committee as introduced.

Now, the words are, the carriers of the Rural Free Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum and \$24 per mile for each

additional mile over 24 miles. The great majority of carriers are receiving \$1,200 for a route of 24 to 30 miles. Under this amendment they will receive 15 per cent increase, and in addition to that receive \$24 for every mile besides that. Take a carrier who has a route 30 to 35 miles who is receiving now \$24 for each mile in excess of 30 miles. He will not only receive the 15 per cent in addition to his present pay but will receive also \$24 more for every mile above 24 miles. It is not the purpose of this committee to present any such unfair proposition as that. I think the committee ought to devise some workable scheme whereby all these carriers will receive the same regular increase proportionate to the work they perform. When you have such an unworkable plan whereby you give some 15 per cent plus \$24 a mile and another 15 per cent plus 24 plus 24, that is unworkable.

I took occasion last night to figure out what under the committee amendment the scale of wage would be as reported, and the 25-mile route carrier would receive \$1,224 and 15 per cent additional of his present salary of \$1,200.

Mr. MADDEN. No; he would not.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no question from the phraseology that the carriers of the Rural Free Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum. Who are they? They are not only those covering 24 miles but those up to 30 miles, and they get 15 per cent increase and \$24 for every additional mile from 24 to 30. And, in addition to that, those performing 30 and 36 miles would get \$24 for each mile above 24 and 15 per cent of their present salary, which includes \$24 a mile for each mile traveled above 30 miles. This House does not intend to present any such inequitable proposition as that.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Does this take in motor vehicles? They cover routes up to 50 miles. Would not that take in this class?

Mr. STAFFORD. We have also motor carriers who are covering routes of 50 miles or more, and receiving salaries of \$1,800. They would receive \$24 a mile for every mile above 24 miles.

Mr. McCLINTIC. And this section would include it?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; we are running wild with the Government money, going pell mell in extending increases where they are not justified. The way we are going it will cost the Government \$50,000,000 before we conclude the work this afternoon; we are going at the rate of \$5,000,000 every hour.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "mile," where it last appears, insert "or major fraction thereof based on actual mileage."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the gentleman from Illinois and the chairman of the committee will accept this amendment. In the event that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] prevails it would provide, in addition to an allowance of 15 per cent increase on salaries of rural carriers, an additional allowance of \$24 per mile per annum for each additional mile over 24 miles. The purpose of my amendment is to provide equitable compensation. As a matter of illustration, if a carrier's route was 24.9 miles, under the provision of the bill he would not be entitled to any compensation whatever for that fraction of a mile that he would have to cover every day in the year. Under existing law governing compensation over 30 miles they are entitled to so much per mile for each mile "or major fraction thereof." The purpose of my amendment is to make it apply to routes of over 24 miles or major fraction of a mile as it will develop by actual measurement. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is a thoroughly equitable and just arrangement for compensation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am willing, as far as I am concerned, to accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to take any more time if the proponent of the amendment is willing to accept it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as it would read if amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Madden amendment as proposed to be amended by the Bankhead amendment: Page 1, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That each carrier in the Rural Free Delivery Service now receiving a compensation of \$1,200 or less shall receive in addition thereto 15 per cent of the amount of such compensation and \$24 per mile per annum for each mile or major fraction thereof based on the actual mileage by which his route shall exceed in length 24 miles."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. No.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment which I desire to offer to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, adding, after the word "miles," the following language:

Provided, That motor carriers shall receive 10 per cent per annum additional to what they are now receiving.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the Madden amendment by adding, after the word "miles," at the end of the Madden amendment, the following: "*Provided*, That motor carriers shall receive 10 per cent per annum additional to what they are now receiving."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss it at any length or to detain the committee. The fact is, however, that those who are at all acquainted with this service know that in a great many sections of the country the roads are bad and these motor carriers have to provide their own automobiles and are absolutely responsible for the delivery of the mails. Some of the routes are over 50 miles in length. They are not to get any benefit from the \$24 a mile extra which is given to the ordinary rural carriers who use horse-drawn vehicles. These people, with their routes over 50 miles in length, many of them, over rough roads, find it extremely expensive in keeping up their cars, and I call the attention of the committee to the fact that in sparsely settled sections of the country where the roads are not very good, or so good as they are in New England and other more thickly populated sections of the country, where the carrier has a route, say, of 50 miles or more, he must start out in the morning, and there are no garages every few miles, as there are in other sections of the country. His car is liable to break down 25 miles away from home, and the only way in the world to get the car repaired is to get it back to the town from where he started, as that town probably has the only garage there is in that section. He is forced, then, to hire teams or cars or something in order to make his rounds and get his mail delivered on time. Most of the carriers in my section of the country are forced to own and keep two separate cars and keep them in condition in order to carry out the terms of their contract.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was wondering whether there could be any confusion on the administration of the law because of the designation in the amendment of "motor carriers" with those rural free delivery carriers who for nine months of the year, as is quite general in western and northwestern sections of the country, and I imagine in many other parts of the country, use an automobile for delivery on rural free delivery routes and during the winter season for three months use horse-drawn vehicles. During those nine months they may be considered motor carriers.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I hardly think so, because motor routes and horse-drawn vehicle routes are clearly differentiated in the department. I think a motor carrier would be understood by the language in the amendment.

Mr. STEENERSON. This particular service is the contract service, is it not? It is all under contract—they agree to carry it for so much?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, no; I do not understand it that way. There are motor carriers appointed under the civil service the same as the horse-drawn vehicle carriers are.

Mr. STEENERSON. It is a motor route?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; but they are appointed under the civil service the same as the others are. This would give them, I think, about \$1,980.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the designation indicated in the amendment of the gentleman from Florida specify clearly enough just what class of rural carriers would be affected by the provisions of his amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think it does. There is a very clear differentiation in the department.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not know whether there was or not.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think there is.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. COX. It strikes me that the query propounded by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is important. For instance, in my own State I know several counties that happen to have good roads the year round, where rural routes are all carried by automobiles.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. COX. They are the ordinary rural routes, 24 miles in length, and possibly some of them up to 30 miles.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will say to the gentleman that I know a good many in my own district that are horse-drawn routes where they use a motor car.

Mr. COX. I think what the gentleman is trying to get at is where the routes are 50 miles or over and to increase the pay there.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. COX. Would it not be a little better to add that phrase to the amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would not object to the gentleman offering that amendment.

Mr. COX. I think that would clarify it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Then I ask unanimous consent to put those words into the amendment—"motor carriers on routes of 50 miles or more."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. What would be the average compensation of these motor carriers under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. About \$1,980 a year.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why should these carriers receive \$1,980 and our rural mail carriers in the Northwest, who are forced to buck blizzards and maintain three or four horses and an automobile, receive only \$1,320?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Because I think their expenses are much more than the others.

Mr. KNUTSON. Wherein are their expenses greater?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman owns a car and buys gasoline he ought to know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment—

The CHAIRMAN. We have not disposed of this amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Florida modifies his amendment by inserting after the word "carriers" the words "on routes of 50 miles or more," so that as amended it will read: "*Provided*, That motor carriers on routes of 50 miles or more shall receive 10 per cent per annum additional to what they are now receiving."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Clark amendment.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman arise?

Mr. STEENERSON. To oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this amendment applies to routes established under the proviso of the joint resolution of March 4, 1915, which reads as follows:

Provided, That in the discretion of the Postmaster General the pay of carriers who furnish and maintain their own motor vehicles and who serve routes of not less than 50 miles in length may be fixed at not exceeding \$1,800 per annum.

Now, these are substantially contract routes. The Postmaster General has the discretion to not exceed \$1,800, and they agree to that rate, and it is fixed by him. Now, it seems to me this would change the contract and allow them a pay more than they had agreed to perform the service for.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield for a question or a suggestion?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not understand there is any contract about this matter at all any more than any other employee of the Government. All of these motor carriers are appointed under civil service. They are examined the same as the others, and their compensation is fixed by law, the same as the others.

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, no; it is fixed by the Postmaster General, and the compensation is within his discretion.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It is fixed by him under the authority that the Congress has granted him, so it is fixed by law after all.

Mr. STEENERSON. These regular carriers' salaries are fixed by law, but these so-called motor routes—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say to my friend there is absolutely nothing of what we usually understand as a contract in it. They take the civil-service examination, it is competitive; they have to stand that examination, and I want to call attention to the fact that they are the only ones in this bill whose salaries are not increased a particle.

Mr. STEENERSON. If the gentleman desires to increase the discretion of the Postmaster General to allow them more it might be very well—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. But we are trying to exercise some discretion of our own right now in enacting this law.

Mr. STEENERSON. But you are applying it to the class of carriers who actually agree to perform a service at so much per year, whether \$1,800 or what it was.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The law is they shall not receive to exceed \$1,800.

Mr. STEENERSON. In the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Now, as a matter of fact, what do they receive?

Mr. STEENERSON. Most of them receive \$1,800. I do not think it would be advisable to impose upon the Government the obligation of paying them more than they agree to accept. It is true they are civil-service appointees, so far as being eligible to the position, but before they accept the position they agree to perform the service at that rate.

Mr. WALDOW. One of the provisions of this bill is to provide for an increase in the compensation of the employees of the Post Office Department. Would not that cover the men the gentleman from Florida has in mind?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not think that applies to star route carriers, which are the same as motor route carriers. They are contract men; they are not salaried employees at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. CLARK of Florida) there were—yeas 34, yeas 61.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida demands tellers. Eleven gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida makes the point of order there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-four gentlemen are present, a quorum.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does not the vote now come on the Madden amendment as amended?

The CHAIRMAN. On the amendment to the Madden amendment.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. ALMON. By striking out "fifteen" in line 3 and inserting the word "twenty."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "twenty" and insert "twenty-five."

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that is an amendment in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the Madden amendment offered by Mr. ALMON: In the third line of the Madden amendment strike out the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty," so it will read: "That each carrier on rural free-delivery routes now receiving compensation of \$1,200 or less shall receive in addition thereto 20 per cent of the amount of such compensation," etc.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for the purpose of correcting, in a measure at least, a very glaring inequality in this bill against 43,318 rural mail carriers, who carry daily letters, newspapers, and parcel post to 5,882,799 families on the farms, representing 27,000,000 people, or one-fourth of our population.

This bill increases the salaries of city letter carriers, post-office clerks in the first and second class offices, and the railway mail clerks at least 20 per cent, and some of them 25 per cent, and only provides for a 15 per cent increase for rural carriers. Many of the Members of this House have expressed deep and

profound sympathy and friendship for the rural carriers. Some of them have almost brought tears to the eyes of the Members of the House as they have told of the hardships endured by these carriers. Sympathy and friendship will not pay for horse feed, groceries, shoes and clothing or for the education of the carrier's children.

Now, I am going to give you an opportunity to show your friendship and sympathy for these worthy and faithful men by voting for my amendment providing for a 20 per cent increase in their salaries during the war, on account of the increase in the cost of living, and to equalize the salaries of the postal employees. [Applause.]

Provision in this bill for the payment of \$24 per mile per annum on routes from 24 to 30 miles in length should not be regarded as an increase. It should have been the law all the time. It was never right to pay a carrier on a 30-mile route the same as one on a 24-mile route.

Other Government employees are provided with everything necessary to the performance of their duties, while rural carriers are required to provide and maintain, at their own expense, all necessary equipment. It necessitates an average initial outlay of about \$600 and an average of \$50 per month thereafter under present conditions.

There is a general demand from every part of the country for an allowance for equipment for rural-mail carriers, but there is no provision for it in this bill.

Mounted city letter carriers are allowed the entire cost of equipment and maintenance, amounting, as I am advised, in many cases to \$1,000 per year. Rural carriers have no chance of promotion. They must give first consideration to their equipment, which must be kept in good condition to render efficient service. The support of their families and the education of their children must be made second to this.

An enormous amount of parcel post has been added since their compensation was fixed, and a heavy increase in the ordinary mail matter. They are exposed to all kinds of weather. When they start out on their trip, with several hundred people to serve, they must continue regardless of the weather or the condition of the roads. I have traveled over most of the routes in my district during the winter months, and I know of the difficulties the rural carriers encounter and the hardships they endure. With such weather as we had last winter, with the thermometer 10° to 15° below zero in the Southern States and 40° to 50° below in the Northern States, they must have suffered many hardships—oftentimes not sufficiently clad to protect them from the bitter cold.

The rural carriers in my district have sent me itemized accounts of the cost of maintenance of horses and vehicles for 1917, and they average \$50 per month, or one-half of their salary, counting nothing for depreciation. Since their salary was fixed the price of corn has increased from 50 cents to \$1.50 or more per bushel, and oats in about the same proportion; hay from \$15 to \$30 or more per ton. So they are affected more than other employees of the Government on account of the increased cost of the necessities of life.

It is not surprising that 3,705 rural carriers resigned during the last six months of 1917 in order to enter other employment at better wages. As they resign, their places are taken by men without experience and whose service can not be as satisfactory to the Government, or the people they serve, as that of experienced carriers.

We should give the people in the country, as well as in towns and cities, the very best possible mail service, especially now, when so many of them are anxiously awaiting news from loved ones in the Army, some of whom are already fighting in the trenches in France. They are entitled to the very best service. [Applause.]

The rural carrier is in a sense the farmer's postmaster, as well as his carrier. He discharges practically all the duties of a fourth-class postmaster.

The Post Office Department is more than self-sustaining. The increase in postal rates was not for the support of the Post Office Department, but to raise money to assist in paying the expenses of the war.

Wages of carpenters, bricklayers, stonemasons, farm labor, and so forth, have more than doubled during the last few years on account of the increased cost of living. Then why should we withhold from these faithful, deserving, and worthy rural carriers a just and reasonable compensation for their services. "A laborer is worthy of his hire," no matter where he works. [Applause.]

CITY LETTER CARRIERS, POST OFFICE CLERKS, AND RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

The bill reclassifies and readjusts the salaries and provides for the promotion of the city letter carriers, clerks in first and second class post offices, and railway mail clerks, as provided

in the bill introduced by Mr. MADDEN, of Illinois, at this session of Congress.

These postal employees are as faithful and efficient men as can be found in any department of the Government. Under present conditions they are entitled to an increase of compensation, but no greater than the rural carriers. Let us do justice to them equally.

CLERKS IN THIRD-CLASS POST OFFICES.

If provision can not be made in this bill for a fair compensation for clerks in third-class post offices, then I am in favor of doing it in some other way. They are now paid out of an allotment from a lump-sum appropriation, which heretofore has been inadequate and insufficient, and the postmasters have been forced to add to it out of their own salaries, which is not right and should not be expected or required.

FOURTH-CLASS POSTMASTERS.

Everybody, I believe, agrees that fourth-class postmasters, who are not allowed anything for office rent or anything else, are paid less for their time and work than anyone else in the service of the Government. No change in the method of their compensation has been made for half a century. This bill very properly gives them increase of compensation, in that it allows them 100 per cent of cancellations up to and including \$100 or less quarterly, instead of \$50 under existing law, based on postal rates prior to recent act increasing postal rates to defray war expenses.

STAR ROUTE CARRIERS.

Many star route carriers made contracts when the cost of living and equipment was very much less than it is now, and are carrying the mail at a heavy loss. Justice and equity suggest that the Government should make additional allowance in such cases. The purpose of section 4 of this bill is to authorize the Postmaster General to adjust the compensation of such star route carriers.

Congress has made reasonable increase in the compensation of all the other employees of the Government on account of the increased cost of all the necessities of life. We should do the same for the postal employees.

In conclusion I want to say if some of the postal employees are to be given an increase of 20 per cent, as provided in this bill, then let us give it to all of them. But if some are to be given only 15 per cent increase, then let it be 15 per cent to all alike. All I ask is that justice be done to the rural carriers as well as to the other postal employees. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman rise in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. QUIN. Yes, sir. [Applause.]

I hope this House will give me its attention for five minutes. There has in all this debate, up until this hour, but one Representative appeared here to say a word for the taxpayers of this Republic. I now stand up to speak for the people who must pay the bills which Congress makes against them. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] stated some pertinent facts to this Congress. This country is engaged in this great conflict at present with all its resources taxed, with the people in every walk of life taxed to the utmost limits, and the American Congress, disregarding those people who pay the taxes, goes into a carnival of extravagance in an effort to increase the salaries of these people who hold the lifetime positions of civil-service clerks, rural carriers, and city letter carriers, throughout this Republic, and thinking not for the man who has to foot the bills.

Do you know that under this bill you have made permanent law by your amendment here to-day that all of this increased postage that you have put upon the American people is taken away, and \$7,000,000 in addition? This bill increases the salaries of all civil-service postal employees to the extent that the increase alone for the first year is \$33,000,000 and the fourth year the increase is \$60,000,000. The increased taxes that they are paying by postage, 3 cents on a letter instead of 2 cents, amounting to \$26,000,000 annually, the people who pay it willingly and patriotically believe these extra postage stamps are going to help foot the bills for this war; but instead of doing that it is telling the farmer who puts 3 cents on his letter, the merchant, the blacksmith, the clerk, the banker, whoever the taxpayer is, that the man who brings his letter to him is receiving that extra 1 cent that he has to put on every letter which he sends. The letter carriers themselves would not ask the farmers nor any other people to do that. I will not vote to take that extra cent on each letter from the farmer and give it to the letter carrier. [Applause.]

Do you know, my friends, that when the people of this country realize that with this \$15,000,000,000 that this Congress is bound to appropriate this year to meet the expenses of the

Government and to prosecute this war, with the \$29,000,000 that you put on the bill the other day to increase the salaries of the department clerks in this city and elsewhere, which I voted against, and then you come here in one wild swoop and put on this increase, that they will not approve it?

A MEMBER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield to a gentleman who seems to have no regard for the people who pay the bills, and who tells the farmer of his district that the rural carriers ought to get \$1,000 a year, when that poor farmer is doing well when he goes out with his children and works from daylight in the morning until the dewy eve if he makes a living, even with his wife and children working in the field with him.

It strikes me that the gentlemen who were so impatient here and who were so rampant to give the organized forces of civil-service employees a regular grand handbag of the Treasury have disregarded the third-class post offices, where they have not the civil-service organization to back them. There is not a line in this bill to give the poor clerk in the third-class post offices, who gets about \$15 or \$25 a month from the Government and \$10 or \$15 from the postmaster himself, an increase. If you pretend to be so righteous and holy and want to do what is right about it in this bill, give the third-class postmasters a chance to give their clerks a decent living wage while you are running wild here to-day, increasing all of these \$1,200 clerks, and \$1,400 clerks, and \$1,800 clerks, and \$2,000 employees, and leaving the poor little fellow that is getting \$25 a month that works—not 8 hours a day, but 12 or 14 hours a day—in the third-class post offices of this country no increase at all.

There is one good feature in this bill, and that is the one giving the fourth-class postmaster some increase. The other features of this bill, facing the great emergency that we do, are all wrong. I shall vote against the bill.

You do not increase the poor star-route contract carrier. He does not get half as much as the rural carrier—holding a lifetime job. Why do you not increase his salary? Is it because he belongs to no organization?

We are calling on all of our citizens back home to make sacrifices for the war. The people are willingly doing that. I now call on the rural carriers, the city carriers, and all other postal employees to make the same sacrifice. I know the cost of living is high, but we must all bravely meet the emergency. The cost of taxes is high, too. Instead of increasing the salaries of employees of the Government, I prefer to get more rural routes established in my district—to get daily mail to the farmers. We can not expect to get new rural routes established if you vote all the money into increasing the salaries of the clerks and letter carriers. There are many applicants for every rural-route vacancy in my district at the present salary of \$1,200 a year.

I shall vote to protect the taxpayers of this Republic. I shall vote to conserve the resources of this country, and to maintain the liberties of the people, and to protect the civilization of America by preventing, so far as I can, these raids on the Treasury of the people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] a vote shall be taken on the pending amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. A vote shall be taken on what?

Mr. MOON. On the pending amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. That is the Madden amendment?

Mr. MOON. Yes; I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] a vote be had on the Madden amendment and amendments thereto.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understood that the gentleman from Tennessee having this bill in charge asked unanimous consent that we have a vote on the Almon amendment.

Mr. MOON. I said the pending amendment. I do not know which it is. It seems every amendment offered to increase the pay of the carriers will get votes.

Mr. AUSTIN. I shall ask to have five minutes at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides an increase of compensation for rural carriers, clerks in

first and second class post offices, letter carriers in City Delivery Service, railroad postal clerks, assistant postmasters in first and second class post offices, postmasters of the fourth class, and other employees in the Post Office Department and the Postal Service. Further, it provides that the conditions that have arisen under the contracts in the star route, and screen-wagon service shall be investigated, with a view to affording compensation, and adjustment in all of the cases, where the facts disclose the propriety and necessity for such adjustment.

Having in mind the circumstances under which these advances will be afforded, no one can successfully maintain that the recommendations of the committee err in the direction of prodigal extravagance. Quite the contrary. In most instances, the compensation proposed should be somewhat advanced, in order that it may be made commensurate with the increased cost of living, and I propose to support all proper amendments providing for such advances. Officials in the Government service are affected to the same extent as employees in civil life, by the continually advancing cost of living. Indeed, some of these employees are much harder hit than employees in civil life, for the reason that as a part of their job, they are required to maintain a necessary outfit of motor, or horse-drawn vehicles. This is particularly true of the rural carriers. The work of the employees in this branch of the Postal Service has been made more onerous in comparatively recent years, by a vast increase in the quantity of mail matter proper, and further by the establishment and development of the parcels post. Many of the carriers who were able to serve their routes 10 years ago with a very modest equipment, frequently on horseback, with a small bag for carrying the letters, newspapers, and other mail, now find themselves confronted with the necessity of operating wheeled vehicles through the greater portion of the year, and maintaining two horses at least, for motive purposes. Nor is this all. In addition to the need for a far more extensive outfit, the carrier has found that the cost of maintaining that outfit, has increased by leaps and bounds.

Corn that was formerly 85 cents, or a dollar a bushel, now sells for \$2 and more a bushel. Hay that was eighteen to twenty dollars a ton, now sells for \$40, or more. Other articles have advanced in like proportion. Should a carrier endeavor to serve his route in part by motor car, he finds that as compared with 10 years ago, gasoline has advanced two or three hundred per cent. Moreover the cost of maintenance of a motor car, is not a mere matter of gasoline charges. Such a car requires in the course of a year, considerable repair work, and the cost of this repair work is advancing all the time. Nor are carriers who seek to avail themselves of the modern motor car in order to expedite deliveries on their routes, able to confine themselves to the use of motor cars only. In a large proportion of the States, notably in Virginia, and many other Southern States, and particularly in the mountain areas of those States, a motor car can not be operated more than from six to nine months a year, under the generally prevailing weather and road conditions. Hence the carriers who undertake to use such a car, must provide and maintain for the service on their routes, both vehicles and horses in addition to the car. During the winter months, and at times during the bad weather in other seasons, the carrier must abandon his motor car, and revert to the more primitive method of transporting his mail in a horse-drawn vehicle. Many of the carriers in my district have given statements in detail as to the cost of their outfits, and the maintenance of the same. I have taken pains to examine these statements, some of them relating to service in the mountainous sections, and others to service in the comparatively level counties at the other end of the district. They all agree in substance, though differing in details. Corn may be cheaper in one county than in another, but where corn is cheaper, oats, or hay may be higher. Hence, as stated, the maintenance charges are in substantial agreement.

The cost of a carrier's outfit differs somewhat, in the several counties composing my district. Horses apparently are cheaper in some counties, than in others. The original, as well as the maintenance cost of the motor vehicles used, seem to be practically the same in all of the counties. In the statements submitted, an allowance is made for depreciation. This item of course is intended to provide a replacement fund for wornout horses and apparatus, whether the latter is a motor, or a horse-drawn vehicle. The routes in my district are as a rule from 21, to 26 miles in length, many of them over exceedingly rugged country, where the roads are bad, and the winters long and severe. It has been frequently stated that a large proportion of the rural carriers work on an average about four hours a day. How this claim originated, or upon what basis it rests, I am utterly unable to comprehend. The carriers in my district require in the main from six to eight hours a day to make their

trips, and while of course those who use motor cars are enabled under favorable conditions to serve a route in a much shorter time, such carriers are at greater expense, by reason of the fact that they must maintain a double outfit, as compared with the carriers who use horse-drawn vehicles exclusively. The figures given by the carriers are interesting, and instructive, and I will cite a few of them, making the citations from the different counties of my district, in order that a composite picture of the value of a rural carrier's job in that portion of Virginia, may be accurately presented.

One carrier reporting from Franklin County uses two horses and one vehicle on his route. He puts the value of these horses at the very modest estimate of \$315. The value of his vehicle and harness are respectively placed at \$28, and \$15. The cost of oats, corn, and hay for feed for a year is given at \$456, repairs and horseshoeing are stated at \$12.50, and other feed and expenses at \$54. His allowance for depreciation is put at \$50. The aggregate of these items is \$572.50.

This carrier's route is 21.3 miles, and his gross salary is \$1,080. The net balance for the support of the carrier and his family is \$507.50—or something over \$40 a month. In that community oats are 75 cents a bushel, corn \$1.50 per bushel, hay \$35 a ton.

I take an illustration from another county in my district, a mountain county, where the carrier likewise uses two horses, and one vehicle. The aggregate cost of horses, vehicle and harness is put at \$430. The cost of feed, horseshoeing, vehicle repairs, and depreciation, is put at \$665. The net balance for the support of this carrier, and family is \$315. In that section, corn costs \$2 a bushel. The cost of other items is not given.

The next illustration is taken from the extreme eastern portion of my district, where the roads are fairly good, and the route is 24 miles long. On that route, the carrier uses a car for nine months in the year, and a horse-drawn vehicle during the remaining three months. His aggregate necessary outfit therefore, is one motor car, two horses, and one vehicle. The cost of his motor car is put at \$395. The upkeep of the same for nine months, including depreciation, is \$313. The value of his horses and vehicles is placed at \$275. The cost of upkeep for same for three months, including depreciation, is \$225. The total cost of upkeep is \$538, leaving \$662 for the carrier, or about \$55 a month. In that section, gasoline is 27 cents a gallon, oats a dollar a bushel, corn \$2 a bushel, hay \$40 a ton.

Another illustration is taken from a mountain county, where a motor vehicle can be used for six months in the year. This carrier has a route of about 23 miles, and a salary of \$1,152. He maintains two horses, and one vehicle. The cost of this outfit is placed at \$350, and maintenance of the same at \$300. Maintenance of his motor car is put at \$200. This carrier has a net salary for the support of himself and family of \$652 a year. Gasoline costs him 34 cents a gallon, oats \$1.10 a bushel, corn \$2.05 a bushel, and hay \$18 a ton. The next illustration will be taken from the central portion of my district, where there is a fairly good system of hard, and dirt roads. This carrier has a 24-mile route, and a \$1,200 a year salary. He maintains two horses, and two vehicles. The cost of his outfit is put at \$370, repairs on, and maintenance of same, \$788.50, leaving something like \$411.50 a year for the support of carrier and family. In that section, oats cost 98 cents a bushel, corn \$2 a bushel, and hay \$42.50 a ton. The following figures relate to a county in the extreme western end of my district, a very mountainous county, where the roads are practically dirt roads, and very bad. This carrier has a route of 24.7 miles, and a gross salary of \$1,200. He maintains two horses, and one vehicle. The cost of his outfit is placed at \$411. The total cost of maintenance and repairs at \$725. The net balance for support of carrier and family is \$475. In that community oats are from 90 cents, to a dollar a bushel, corn \$2 a bushel, and hay \$22 a ton.

One more illustration will be taken from a mountain county, where the roads are rough, and bad. In this case, the carrier has a 23-mile route, and a salary of \$1,152. He uses two horses, and two vehicles. The cost of his outfit is put at \$464.50. The cost of their upkeep at \$552, leaving \$600 for the support of carrier and family. In this community oats cost \$1.25 a bushel, corn \$2 a bushel, and hay \$40 a ton. It will be noted upon inspection of the figures given, that while some of the items may be questioned, the valuation placed on the prime cost of the vehicles, horses and harness, are in all cases moderate and reasonable. The depreciation figure may be challenged, but in no cases is that an extravagant item. The cost of horse feed is the market cost, and the items for repairs are always moderate. The cost of gasoline where a motor vehicle is used, is always the market price. Whatever changes might be made in a critical readjustment of the items embraced in the totals submitted, the conclusion that will be reached in all of these cases,

will be that these totals are substantially correct, and that a rural carrier serving a full route, after the payment of maintenance costs and charges on his outfit, receives something like five or six hundred dollars a year for living purposes, that is, for the support of himself and family. In other words, he is working at wages that represent from \$40 to \$50 a month, in the discharge of duties which require the qualities of fidelity, industry, sobriety, intelligence, and integrity. There are so many jobs in civil life which pay better salaries to men possessing these qualities, that it is no wonder that resignations from the rural carrier service are multiplying. In many instances, owing to the conditions of the roads, the work is very arduous, since Uncle Sam's mail must be carried under practically all weather conditions. The figures given afford the most cogent reasons for an increase in the compensation of this great army of faithful employees who are doing their bit in an important branch of the Government service, and who whether the winds blow high, or low, plod their way through storm, and rain, and icy blizzards, and deliver the mail with unfailing regularity on their routes.

I submit Mr. Chairman, that a position which calls for the qualities required in a rural carrier, and to which are attached duties of the onerous and responsible character which I have indicated, justifies a living wage. This wage is provided by the amendment which will be adopted to this bill. The case for increase of compensation for the clerks in the first, and second class post offices, the assistant postmasters in such offices, the letter carriers in the City Delivery Service, and the railway postal clerks, is also a strong one.

These employees are not required to maintain an elaborate, and expensive outfit, nor are they in the main exposed to the hardships of outdoor service, but they discharge important, and responsible duties, and are rigidly held to a high standard of efficiency. The railway mail clerk often has to work while others are asleep. He is exposed to the dangers of rail travel at all times. His hours of service are frequently long, and his duties are exacting and nerve wrecking. The service is a hazardous and dangerous one, and there is no class of our civil employees which more justly deserves a liberal compensation, than the railway clerks. One feature of their service, and a most undesirable one, is their liability to sudden transfers. A railway mail clerk may develop efficiency to the last degree, but that efficiency will not save him against translation to another and undesirable run. He may have been on a run for years, and bought a home, with the fond hope of permanent establishment in that locality, only to find after a few years of life in the community of his choice, that he must choose between a transfer to a new and remote section, with all the inconveniences that attach to a sudden change of location, or the loss of his position. Having in mind the dangers of this service, the high degree of expert knowledge required, and the liability to sudden transfers, who will gainsay the justice of the moderate increase in the salaries of the railway clerks that this bill will afford? Like all other employees of the Government, they are affected by that high cost of living which has justified the increase of compensation which has been given to the employees of the railroads, and the great industrial enterprises.

It is a pleasing thing to recognize that the men who work in the first, and second class post offices, and as carriers in the City Delivery Service have not been overlooked.

They too, and deservedly, have been included within the benefits of this measure. It has been stated as a fact that the maximum wage for these workers was established something like 10 years ago.

Since that time the cost of living has steadily advanced. This advance has operated in effect a wage reduction for these employees. Indeed the character of the service required of many of these employees, the uncertainty of promotion, and in many cases the exacting work at night, has caused such an exodus of workers in many of the cities, that the proper work of the offices in those localities has been seriously crippled. The adjustments, and increase of compensation afforded by this bill, are designed to retain efficient employees now in the service, and to attract other workers to fill the vacancies constantly arising.

The new salaries, after all, if the comparison is made with the old salaries, do not present a case of real increase. The purchasing power of the new salaries under present conditions, will be no greater than the purchasing power of the salaries of 10 years ago. As some one has remarked, this is in reality a restoration, not an increase of salaries. Another situation provided for by this bill, is an increase of compensation for the third-class postmasters, and the clerks in those offices. Having in view the meager allowance for clerk hire in the third-class offices, an allowance which the postmaster is compelled in most if not all cases to supplement out of his own slender salary, it

has been an occasion of wonder to all who are cognizant of the facts, that the postmasters in these offices have been able to retain their clerks against the attractions of other employments. Indeed in many instances they have been unable to do so. The hours of service are long, the work itself is laborious and confining, and the compensation for clerks in these offices, as compared with the wages paid to employees doing a like amount of work in other clerical positions, is wholly inadequate.

The contention is often made that the fourth-class postmasters are perhaps the most poorly paid employees in the Postal Service. No change in the method of computing their compensation has been made in 50 years.

While other postal employees are working 8 hours a day, third, and fourth class postmasters must work from 12, to 14 hours. They furnish their quarters, and pay for their fuel, and light. The salaries of fourth class postmasters run from a minimum of a few dollars a month, to a maximum of something like \$80 a month. In a fourth class office of the maximum compensation which, it may be noted, is just below the minimum for a third class office, the work is fully as arduous as that in a third class office.

The average compensation in the fourth class offices has been placed at \$500 a year, out of which light, heat, clerk hire, and any other running expenses must be paid. Like all other persons, the fourth class postmasters place their request for an increase of compensation upon the admitted, and striking advance in the cost of living. The bill provides that postmasters of the fourth class shall receive the same compensation as provided by law prior to the act of 1917, except that they shall receive 100 per cent of the cancellations up to and including \$100 quarterly. This increase is so moderate, and so reasonable, that I fancy not a voice will be raised in opposition to this section of the bill.

There is another class of persons who have been more severely hit by the high cost of living, than perhaps the clerks, and other employees in the Postal Service. I refer to the star-route contractors.

In my judgment there is no more meritorious section of this bill than the one which undertakes to afford relief to these parties. I would not favor a proposition which sought to compel the Government to supplement the amount of a star-route bid to such an extent that the contractors would be guaranteed a profit. The equities of the case do not call for such a guaranty, nor is that what is proposed to be done by this section. Many of the star-route contractors are men of small means who undertook these contracts on a very narrow margin of profit. In a number of cases the margins were so close, that the contractors were in substance hiring themselves and their teams to the Government, at a very moderate wage. These contracts were made one year, or more ago. Since that time we all know that great changes have occurred throughout the entire country in the items of living cost for man and beast. A very large proportion of the Members of this body represent country districts, and are familiar with the conditions I am describing. I think I am justified in appealing to these Members to confirm all that I have said with reference both to the small margin of possible profit in a large proportion of these contracts, and the plight in which the contractors now find themselves, in consequence of supervening conditions. Many of these contractors are discharging their contracts at a daily, and ruinous loss.

THE CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the Almon amendment.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. ALMON. Division, Mr. Chairman. Come on, boys, and vote for 20 per cent!

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 97, yeas 28.

Mr. COX. I demand tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were refused, four Members, not a sufficient number, rising to second the demand.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the Madden amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. May we have that reported as amended?

THE CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MADDEN as amended: Page 1, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That each carrier in the Rural Free Delivery Service now receiving a compensation of \$1,200 or less shall receive in addition thereto 20 per cent of the amount of such compensation, and \$24 per mile per annum for each mile or major fraction thereof based on actual mileage by which his route shall exceed in length 24 miles."

THE CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Madden amendment as amended.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the Madden amendment offered by Mr. RANDALL: Strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, on page 1, and insert: "That carriers in the Rural Free Delivery Service who receive under existing law a salary of \$1,200 or less per annum shall after the passage of this act receive in addition thereto \$24 per mile per annum for each mile or major fraction thereof by which his route shall exceed 24 miles and not exceed 30 miles: *Provided*, That all carriers in the Rural Free Delivery Service shall receive 20 per cent in addition to the salary fixed by law when such salary shall not exceed \$1,500, and 10 per cent in addition thereto where such salary exceeds \$1,500 per annum."

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment agrees exactly with the Madden amendment as amended, with the exception that it provides that the additional \$24 per mile for the extra mileage shall end at 30 miles. Under the present law, carriers are paid \$24 per mile for a route exceeding 30 miles, and the intention of the committee—and the error was called to our attention by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAROB]—was that the \$24 per mile extra should be paid for those routes on which the carriers travel over 24 miles and not exceeding 30 miles. In addition to that, a 10 per cent increase is given for motor-route carriers similar to that suggested by the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

The Rural Mail Service is entitled to the most liberal consideration of this House, because it makes rural life attractive. Attractive rural conditions may help to save the world from starvation. We need more people on the farms. Every dollar that we give to making rural life appeal to people who live in towns helps to make the world safe for democracy and democracy safe for the world.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the substitute which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the substitute offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Strike out the words "twenty-four dollars" and insert in lieu thereof "fifty dollars."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the House but a short time on this amendment. In presenting it I want to say that when all the rest of the Government clerks are getting an increase in salary, and when manufacturers and employers are increasing the wages they pay to their employees, I do not see the policy of paying a person \$50 a mile for carrying the mail the first 24 miles and only \$24 a mile for all the distance over 24 miles.

The hardest part of the route is the increased mileage over 24 miles, and just why the carrier should carry his mail for just half of the rate he gets for carrying the first 24 miles looks inconsistent. I think it is worth more to carry the mail that added distance. I think these men work just as hard to cover that distance and are entitled to the same compensation and the same rate they get for the other part of their route. For that reason I hope the amendment will prevail.

So much for that. I wish further to state that I am in favor of increasing the pay of our postal clerks and rural carriers. There are several reasons which especially appeal to me why this should be done. I wish to mention one or two at this time. The first is that I think their services are worth more than they are getting at the present time, according to what is paid other laborers doing this kind of work. They must especially fit themselves for this service, find themselves, furnish an outfit, keep it in repair, be punctual, assume responsibility and accuracy. Who ever heard of a rural mail carrier getting rich? That does not happen in the carrier business.

Another reason is that it is simple justice, as was explained by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the author of the bill, and who has worked so hard to present this bill and bring it before the Congress. We have voted to increase the salary and compensation of all other Government clerks and employees, and why not the postal clerks? Is it fair to do that? It is simply discriminating against the postal employees to raise the pay of all others who work for the Government and leave them out.

Another thing, and that is that employers of every kind and in all classes of business are increasing the salaries of their employees, and why not the Government increase the pay of its employees? Is it that the Government is less able or the postal clerks less entitled to an increase? No reason has been given why the pay of the others should be increased that will not apply to them. Again, and perhaps the best reason and the one most frequently given, is that of the increased cost of everything the carrier must pay for, everything he gets, and this applies to the doctor, the rents, his upkeep, and clothing, as well as his food. If he attends the picture show, he pays more; and I think if anyone needs to have diversion it is the laboring

and the small-salaried man. Why can not Uncle Sam afford to pay more now than he formerly did? We have increased the price of postage on all classes of mail matter. The Government is getting more for the work done, and it is only fair that the employees who do the work should participate in this added revenue and income.

If I were to make any criticism of this bill, I would say the increase is not enough. It was proven before the committee, what we all know to be a fact, that the 15 per cent provided by this bill does not begin to meet the increased cost of living and supplies the carriers are compelled to furnish to carry on the work. The average increased cost of living since the war is said to be 68 per cent. I think it is 100 per cent. But be that as it may, I am sure that the increased compensation provided by this bill will leave a deficiency at the end of each year which the carrier will have to make up. I think the rural carrier—and I will apply it to every postal and other employee of the Government—is entitled to such a wage and compensation that he can live well, buy a home, educate his children, and lay up something for old age. A workman must receive such a wage to be at his best and render good and efficient services.

Mr. Chairman, I know there are those who will say that, if they are not getting enough and can do better elsewhere, why do they not quit and get other employment? Well, that question is, in the first place, not a fair one. A person who has especially fitted himself for a position and has worked at it for a term of years can not seek other employment which is entirely different from that which he has formerly done. There is no work which fits into that of postal clerk or mail carrier. The mail carrier's job is different from that of any other, and there is none like it, so that when he quits it he is not ready to take up other different work. In this connection may I say that many rural carriers and other postal clerks are quitting the service and seeking better employment, and we may sooner or later be confronted with the proposition of competing not only with other employers but with other branches of the Government service to get help to do this work? There are 270,000 employees in the Postal Service. They are among our best citizens. We must treat them fairly. They are necessary in the proper conduct of carrying on the Government. Business men want them, the boys in the trenches want them, and we must have them to help win the war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the substitute of the gentleman from California offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment to the substitute was rejected.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a slight amendment for the purpose of perfecting the text, and I want to know whether I should offer it to the Madden amendment or whether I can offer it to the language after the Madden amendment is voted on. It is to insert two words right after the language "\$1,200 per annum," which is in the original bill, and which is also in the Madden amendment, as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is better to offer it to the Madden amendment after the substitute is voted on. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from California.

The substitute was rejected.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the Madden amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DENISON offers an amendment to the Madden amendment: Page 1, line 9, after the words "per annum," insert the words "exclusive of mileage allowance."

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of correcting what I think is an error in the bill, and I would like to have the attention particularly of the committee, because I think it ought to be in the bill; otherwise there will be an injustice done. The bill now provides for a 20 per cent increase for all rural carriers receiving up to \$1,200 per year. There are a great many carriers whose routes are 31 miles, and their salary amounts at the present time to \$1,224 a year if they travel 31 miles. Therefore, if a man is traveling 31 miles now he will not get the benefit of the 20 per cent, whereas if he has only 24 miles he will get the benefit of it. The result will be that a man traveling 30 miles or less will get a greater salary than a man traveling 31 or 32 miles.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I understand the gentleman's amendment is in line 9, after the word "annum"?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That would not amend the Madden amendment at all.

Mr. DENISON. Is not that in the Madden amendment?
Mr. RAMSEYER. The word "annum" is in there, but it is not in line 9.

Mr. DENISON. My intention is to insert in the Madden amendment, after the words "per annum," the words "exclusive of mileage allowance."

Mr. EMERSON. There is a "per annum" in both lines 8 and 9.

Mr. DENISON. It is to be inserted after the words "per annum" in the Madden amendment. Here is what I mean: If a man is traveling 31 miles, he will get a salary of \$1,200 and \$24 for the extra mile above 30 miles, which makes his salary \$1,224. Under this bill he will receive an increase of \$24 per mile for the 7 miles above 24 miles, which amounts to \$168 in traveling 31 miles, and his total salary will be \$1,368. The man who is traveling 30 miles will get a salary of \$1,200, and he will get an increase of 20 per cent, or \$240, and then he will get pay for the 6 miles at \$24 per mile, making \$144 additional; and you see that the man who travels 30 miles will get about \$216 more salary than the man who travels 31 miles. Therefore this amendment ought to be adopted, so as to exclude the mileage allowance in determining the carrier's salary. If it is adopted, I think the bill ought to pass, so the postal employees will get something near the compensation for their services that they are justly entitled to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to change the language of my original amendment by adding the words "per annum" after the word "less," and I accept the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment by inserting the words "per annum" in the place indicated.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear that read with my amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. The words "per annum" should have been put in after the words "twelve hundred dollars or less."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be reported as amended by the suggested amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MADDEN asked to modify his amendment by inserting the words "per annum" after the word "less" in the second line, so that it will read, "That each carrier in the Rural Free Delivery Service now receiving a compensation of \$1,200 or less per annum shall receive in addition thereto," etc.

The amendment offered by Mr. DENISON proposes to insert, after the words "per annum," the words "exclusive of mileage allowance," so that as amended the amendment will read "each carrier in the Rural Free Delivery Service now receiving a compensation of \$1,200 or less per annum, exclusive of mileage allowance, shall receive in addition thereto 20 per cent of the amount of such compensation," etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. DENISON, of Illinois.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, that seems to me, from hearing the amendment read and listening to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON], to be a meritorious amendment.

Mr. STEENERSON. I agree that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] is correct, and that that ought to be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUSTIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. AUSTIN offers the following amendment: On page 1, line 8, strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-five."

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Is that a proposition to strike out the "twenty" that we have just agreed to?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That can not be done now.

Mr. AUSTIN. Why not?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Because the House has just agreed to it, and that represents the action of the House.

Mr. AUSTIN. If I can get the votes here we will do it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not take issue on that.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I have been trying all the afternoon to get recognition in order to offer this amendment, which would mean an increase of 25 per cent for the rural carriers, or \$300 additional per annum for a carrier whose annual salary is \$1,200. Now that I have it before the House I hope my genial friend from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] will give me an opportunity to present its merits to the House. In this connection I

wish to thank and compliment him for the excellent presentation of the cause of the rural carriers a few minutes ago. Also, I think it is only fair and just to say a word of praise of the membership of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads for reporting the pending measure carrying increased compensation for all postal employees. While they have not, perhaps, gone as far as a majority of us hoped and expected, certainly they are entitled to praise for what they have done in the direction of a deserved increase in the salaries of a faithful and efficient set of Government employees. [Applause.] I think we are all of one mind, namely, that the rural carriers of this country are now taxed to the limit for all the necessities of life by the increased cost from 100 to 400 per cent of everything they must have in order to maintain and keep up this splendid and popular service for the Government and for the benefit of the people of the United States.

I also give my acknowledgment to my colleague from the progressive city of Chattanooga, Judge Moon, for his faithful services on the committee. [Applause.] Then here on this side of the House is our beloved MARTIN MADDEN, always the invincible champion of the postal employees [applause], and from out of the Northwest comes that splendid typical American who is, in season and out of season, working for the interest of the rural carriers, Mr. STEENERSON of Minnesota. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does not the gentleman think the committee deserves a bit of censure for overlooking the star routes in Kentucky and Tennessee and other sections of the country?

Mr. AUSTIN. We can correct that mistake. But the committee has done so well and so handsomely that I think we can afford to overlook the minor faults and only remember the big things they have done, along with their able colleagues on the important Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Now, we are all of one mind, that the cost of the rural service to the carriers, of the maintenance, repair, and upkeep is in the neighborhood of \$500 or \$600 a year. Fifty million dollars appropriated for this entire service in salaries for the carriers, and of this amount the carrier must pay one-half in order to provide and maintain his outfit in order to efficiently discharge his duties. This financial burden is only required of rural carriers and of no other Government officials. I hope we will make the increase \$300 a year—about one-half of the actual upkeep and maintenance cost, according to the statement submitted to us by the carriers residing in our districts. And what a splendid body of men, along with their substitutes, they are! [Applause.] They must pass a civil-service examination, always be on time or suffer a forfeiture, and they have upheld the high standard of American officialdom and have made the post-office service of use and benefit to that great class of our citizenship—25,000,000 farmers—upon whom the hope and faith of the American Republic stands. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HAMLIN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the President had, on March 19, 1918, approved and signed bill of the following title: S. 1854. An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3714) to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. STONE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PENROSE, and Mr. LODGE as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment

of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, and Mr. SMOOT as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASED COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. FIELDS. I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it an amendment to the Madden amendment?

Mr. FIELDS. It is an amendment to the Madden amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FIELDS: Page 1, line 10, after the word "the," insert the words "star and," so that the language as amended will read: "That the carriers on a star and Rural Free Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200," etc.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentlemen reserve the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. No; we can not reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard?

Mr. FIELDS. I think, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who presented the point of order should state it before I am heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MOON. If the Chair has any doubt about it, I do.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard in opposition to the point of order. It seems that the star-route men have not got any friends here.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say on the point of order that this section pertains to rural carriers, and is providing for the pay of rural carriers under a statute to which an amendment is offered to increase the pay. Now the star-route service is altogether a different service. The star-route people do not bear the same relation to the Government that rural carriers do, because the rural carriers are employees of the Government upon a salary, whereas the star-route people are independent, public contractors, antagonistic in the contract, of course, to the Government, and the star-route people are paid according to the contract for an annual service on a given route. You could not in any way connect the star-route people with the rural-route people. You might just as well undertake—and that is just what it would mean exactly—to increase the terms of compensation under a contract made between the Government of the United States and some other people on a competitive bidding proposition. That, of course, can not be done, and the amendment is in no way germane to the section of the bill. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Kentucky that there is a provision in this bill a little later along—

Mr. FIELDS. I have read that provision.

Mr. MOON. That provides that the Postmaster General may readjust contracts by agreement between the star-route people and others, and if he has any amendment he ought to wait until we reach that.

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman think the star-route carrier will ever receive any show whatever with the Postmaster General?

Mr. MOON. Well, I do not see why not—

Mr. LANGLEY. He never has had any.

Mr. BURNETT. He never has had, and that is the best reason I know of in the world.

Mr. FIELDS. I would as soon try to fry a pancake on the North Pole.

Mr. LANGLEY. That whole section is not worth a bag of peanuts to the star-route carriers.

Mr. MOON. You gentlemen who are on the floor discussing this matter, do you think the people will ever have any show with you where the star-route and rural carriers are involved?

Mr. BURNETT. They would if I could get a chance at it; I would give them more pay.

Mr. LANGLEY. Would I.

Mr. MOON. I make the point of order.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says this is a bill dealing with the rural carrier. This bill is a bill that not only deals with the rural carrier, it also deals with the men employed in the transmission and handling of the United States mails. It deals with the clerks in the city offices of the different classes; it deals with railway mail clerks, it deals with the rural carrier, and the star-route carrier, performs the same duties that the railway mail clerk or the rural carrier performs.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I do not yield just now.

Mr. MOON. I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the point of order.

Mr. FIELDS. I am discussing the point of order, and I do not propose to be taken off the floor by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON. Let the Chair rule on that.

Mr. FIELDS. The star carrier is employed by the Government under a different contract technically, but he is an employee of the Government transmitting the same mail that the rural carrier transmits, and if the Congress decides to raise that compensation it has a perfect right to do so, and therefore I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is germane to the bill.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. The increase in this compensation will not invalidate the contract, as the gentleman from Tennessee contended yesterday, if I remember his remarks correctly.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. In a minute. There is not a lawyer in this House who will after careful consideration contend that a contract is invalidated because one of the contracting parties pays to the other a greater sum than he agreed to pay in the original contract.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. FIELDS. And another point suggested by my colleague is that the bill fixes the compensation of the motor-truck carriers, which are at present fixed by regulation.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will allow, the men the gentleman refers to are employees of the Government; the men he seeks to relieve are contractors, not employees of the Government.

Mr. LANGLEY. Those who contract are employees of the Government also.

Mr. FIELDS. They enter into a contract with the Government, and the other men, the star-route carriers also, enter into a contract with the Government to do a given service.

Mr. MADDEN. You might as well say that the shipbuilders making contracts to build ships are employees of the Government in the same sense.

Mr. REED. Do they take the oath of office?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand that the point of order to this amendment was that it was not germane to the bill or not germane to this particular section of the bill? I take it no one will claim that an amendment of this kind could not be made in another place.

Mr. LANGLEY. It could be made under section 4, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the point of order was made that it was not germane to the pending amendment, and the Chair will rule, unless gentlemen want to be heard.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard against the point of order. My argument is argumentum ad judicium. Whatever is right ought to be in order. Gentlemen here have made long-winded speeches in favor of rural carriers, and that is all right. I am one of the friends of those carriers, but I imagine on account of the fact that there are so few of the star-route carriers and they have few votes gentlemen have not shed tears in their interest. Therefore I believe it is in order anywhere, whenever we can do right by anybody, to do it, and right here, when we are increasing the salaries of all of these other carriers, is the place to help the star-route carriers. They can not get loose from their jobs. The rural carriers and nearly everybody else can resign if they desire to do so, but the star-route carrier is held down by his contract, his bid, and his bond. Many of them took the contracts at low rates when provisions for man and beast were low, and now they can not turn them loose.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Section 4 of this bill provides:

That the Postmaster General shall have authority to investigate conditions arising from contracts in the star-route and screen-wagon service with a view to adjusting compensation and adjust the same in cases where the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment.

Mr. BURNETT. The lamb when he appealed to the wolf said, "On account of your love for me I appeal to your mercy," and that will be the kind of mercy. Mr. Chairman, the Postmaster General will show to the star-route carrier. Therefore I maintain that this amendment is in order anywhere, because it is right and just.

I voted most cheerfully to-day for the increase of the salaries of the rural carriers. I have always voted for every bill to help these faithful servants of Uncle Sam, and now I want to vote for an increase for their overworked and underpaid brethren, the star-route carriers.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word on this point of order.

So far as the merits of the star-route cases are concerned, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] that I will go even further than he does. I believe that numbers of the star-route contractors are in a much more desperate condition, than many of the other persons intended to be relieved by this bill. But that has nothing to do with the point of order. We are dealing now with one section of a bill relating to increases of salary of certain employees specifically mentioned in the bill. There is no precedent, I submit, that my friend from Alabama can cite, that under the circumstances would make in order at this time a motion to add to the bill another and different class of beneficiaries. To a limited extent, this bill deals with star-route contractors. But that is in another and later section. Manifestly any proposition relating to star-route carriers must be remitted to that section, and is out of order in the present connection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is not germane to the present pending amendment, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Has debate been exhausted on the Madden amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It has been exhausted on the Madden amendment; yes, sir.

Mr. MOON. Now, is this an amendment to the Madden amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Florida moves to amend the Madden amendment by striking therefrom the words "now receiving a compensation of \$1,200 or less per annum, exclusive of mileage allowance."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly anxious to see that this portion of the bill is so framed that there will be no discrimination. Now, I do not believe that the language which has been added to the Madden amendment is specific and clear enough to accomplish that purpose. This amendment would simply make the increase of 20 per cent applicable to all rural carriers. Now, if one carrier is entitled to the increase the other is entitled to it, and just as much entitled to it as the first one.

Now, for instance, I understand that the law is this, that the maximum pay for a standard route of 24 miles is \$1,200. Up to 31 miles there is no increase, but when a carrier reaches 31 miles he does get an additional \$24 a year. Now, say, for instance, that there is a carrier in existence with a route 32 miles long. He will be getting \$1,248 a year. Under this bill he would not be benefited a penny unless the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] reaches the point, and I do not think it does. Who is to determine what is meant by "mileage allowances," and why should we leave any room for construction? If you leave it that way, it will be involved in doubt, to say the least of it, to determine just what Congress did mean; and if it is construed not to apply to a carrier getting over \$1,200 a year, and I apprehend the department will so construe it, then you will find this state of affairs: You will find a man with a route 32 miles long, when the law becomes effective, getting \$1,248 a year. You will find a man with only 24 miles, who gets \$1,200, getting, when his route is increased 2 miles—that is, to 26 miles—\$1,248 and 20 per cent additional to the \$1,200, which will be \$240 added to that, and in all he will get \$1,448.

Now, we ought not to leave any room for any such discrepancy as that between the pay of these different carriers. I simply want to call this to the attention of the committee. I

believe the language as it is now in the bill is such as to leave it subject to a wrong construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MADDEN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 24, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now recurs on the Madden amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], a member of the committee, offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 2, line 7, after the word "grade" insert the following:

"Provided, That upon the passage of this act clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall pass automatically from the grades therein and the salaries they receive under the act of March 2, 1907, to the corresponding grades, with the additional salaries provided for in this act: *Provided further*, That all promotions of both clerks and carriers shall be made at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of one year's service in the next lower grade."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, that is simply complying with the law that is already in existence. I am not going to take up the time of the House to argue it. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAGUE: Line 13, page 2, after "\$2,000," insert the following:

"Provided, That upon the passage of this act railway postal clerks shall pass automatically from the grades they are in and the salaries they receive under the act of August 24, 1912, to the corresponding grade with the additional salaries provided for in this act."

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is somewhat similar to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], and is merely to make the section come within the provisions of the law.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Is not that the existing law now?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Do you think the Postmaster General would pay any more attention to it if it is reenacted than when it was originally passed?

Mr. TAGUE. I do not care to answer that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized in opposition, if nobody else wishes to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree with the gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. MADDEN. My amendment is already adopted—

Mr. STAFFORD. Or the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] in their statements that the amendments which they propose are merely existing law. It is not the fact. The existing law provides that, so far as clerks and carriers are concerned, there shall be automatic promotions in second-class offices up to the fourth grade, and in first-class offices up to the fifth grade, and that their increases to the higher grades are dependent on the action of Congress.

When the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] attempts by this amendment—and I am surprised that there is not some member of the Post Office Committee who is willing to take up the cudgels in behalf of the Treasury—to permit every railway mail clerk after a service of one year in a grade to the maximum salary of \$2,000, and attempts to have it adopted on the plea that it is existing law, I feel compelled to rise in opposition.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have only five minutes, and I want to go ahead to explain what the purpose is, and to explain the existing practices.

Under the existing practice in the Railway Mail Service there are three classes of service. In all classes they enter at

\$900, and in class A after one year's service they are promoted \$100 each year until they receive \$1,200 as a maximum. That generally applies to the apartment-car service on the minor lines, the maximum salary being \$1,200.

The next grade is class B, where they receive a maximum salary of \$1,300. Class C is the railway postal car service, where the automatic-promotion pay for the clerks is up to \$1,300, and he is privileged to receive the maximum salary of \$1,500.

What do you propose to do under the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts? You intend to destroy all gradation whatsoever of the pay of railway mail clerks based on the character of the service. I served on this committee for 10 years, and it has been the universal practice for all time to recognize the pay of railway mail clerks as based upon the character of service performed. Never have we paid clerks in the apartment-car service the same salary as the clerks in the railway postal car. Here you are giving the clerk in the apartment car, on a small run, a maximum salary of \$2,000, the same as the clerk in charge. Gentlemen, you are going wild to-day in your raid on the Treasury, simply wild.

A few minutes ago I said you were costing the Government \$5,000,000 every hour that this committee was in session. It has been justified to-day by your increasing from 15 per cent to 20 per cent the pay of the rural carriers. You were not content to give to the rural carriers—those serving on routes exceeding 24 miles—the 20 per cent increase, but you gave them an additional \$24 a mile in excess of 24 miles, when many are to-day receiving that additional allowance. Never before in the history of the country has there been such extravagance, and all because you are fearful of the organizations of these postal employees at home, fearful that they may destroy you because you do not have the courage in this crucial time to vote your judgment.

This amendment, if adopted, will cost the Government \$5,000,000 each year, with an increase of \$500,000 or \$600,000 additional every year until they all receive a maximum of \$2,000. Are you in favor of such wasteful extravagance when the Treasury needs all its money for the defense of the boys across the sea? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEATING rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] will be adopted.

I gained recognition, though, to speak of another matter—related to this part of the bill. This paragraph was originally introduced as a bill by our colleague from Minnesota [Mr. VAN DYKE], who for a number of years was a railway mail clerk. He quit the Railway Mail Service largely because of his efforts to benefit the railway mail clerks of this country. Things were made so uncomfortable for him that he was compelled to get out, and thus the way was opened for his election to the Congress of the United States.

I think the Members who have observed his conduct here will agree with me that never during the years he has been in Congress has he for a single moment forgotten "the boys" who still remain in the Railway Mail Service. Mr. VAN DYKE is unable to be here to-day. He is absent in his home city of St. Paul performing a very important public service. A great industrial struggle is disturbing St. Paul, and Mr. VAN DYKE has been requested by the Secretary of Labor to assist in adjusting the controversy. Therefore it is impossible for him to be here this afternoon and witness the triumph of a cause for which he has labored so earnestly and unselfishly. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, it will be unnecessary, of course, for Mr. VAN DYKE to be here. There is no doubt as to the result as these proposed increases in salary are presented. This is a glorious day in the history of our country. The additional salary allowances we gave two or three days ago, of \$120 to each of 240,000 of the highest-paid clerical employees in the world, was merely the barrage fire in preparation for the events of this day; and to-day, with banners flying, gloriously, the membership of this House, in their assault on the Treasury, go over the top, and these absurd amendments are put on this bill. And there seems to be no place to stop. This bill was not recommended by any efficiency committee. These increases and the original bill itself were not recommended by the head of any department, but that does not make any difference. The elections this fall are approaching, and it is an inexpensive proposition to vote here to-day for these demands on the Treasury, to be shared by 300,000 or 400,000 men in the United States,

and then go back home. It is an easy proposition. It makes campaign expenses lighter upon the men who have the courage to vote here for these things, and who have the courage to lay these enormous expenses upon the taxpayers of this country. It is useless to oppose any of these amendments. The only chance the country has with reference to this bill is that all of these additions will be put on hoping that the Senate of the United States will interpose or that the President may interpose his veto. That is the only chance the Treasury has against the movement started upon it here in the House two or three days ago, and carried on with such magnificent success this day. Just a few minutes ago we voted to increase the salaries of rural carriers 20 per cent. I asked the author of this amendment how much it would cost and he did not know how much it would cost the Treasury. It is not interesting to the men who stand for these propositions, it does not interest them, what kind of a demand it makes upon the Treasury of the United States. But I called up the Assistant Postmaster General of the United States and asked him what that amendment would amount to, and he said an addition of 20 per cent to the salaries of rural carriers meant the small item of \$20,000,000 a year. Of course, that is not much with the elections approaching. That is not much with these clerks, all of them organizing. That is not much when the millions who belong to the American Federation of Labor stand back of them pledging their aid and support. This charge that you are making upon the Treasury this day does not amount to much. Where is this money to come from? You are getting part of it by the most oppressive system of taxation this country has ever known. You are getting the most of it by borrowing it, and after this war is over, if it last two or three years longer, we face a budget of \$5,000,000,000 every year containing a fixed annual interest charge upon the money we are borrowing to pay the extravagances of this Congress of perhaps \$2,000,000,000 every year. But that does not make any difference. The movement upon the Treasury has commenced, a glorious movement. Keep the banners flying; keep up the movement; for God's sake do not stop it!

This movement is led by my genial colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], one of the leaders on the Republican side, and back of him stand grandly almost the solid Republican membership of this House, and there are enough Democratic Members following him to make victory sure. The vaults of the Treasury lie open—ask every Government employee to come in and help himself. They are organized, all of them. They think they can defeat any one of you, and you seem to think they can. Of course, your reelection is more important than the safety of the funds we are collecting by taxing the people as they never have been taxed before and by borrowing from the people the money we do not take from them by taxation. Your constituents—those of them who are not the beneficiaries of these salary grabs—were probably under the impression when they voted for you that you would act as reliable custodians of the great fund you are collecting from them. But no such plebeian impulse controls the gentlemen who to-day so grandly and generously vote to give away money which does not belong to them.

The people are paying now 3-cent letter postage without complaining, for the reason that one-third of it goes into the war funds of the Government, and they expect to return to 2-cent letter postage when the war is over. But you have already added \$130,000,000 increase per annum to the expenses of this department, and the bill is not yet concluded—the raid still continues. If the bill you are passing with so much enthusiasm becomes a law—and these are not war-time measures; you are making them permanent—do you realize what you have done? You have made impossible a return to 2-cent letter postage. And that is not all. You have made absolutely necessary legislation in the very near future which will compel newspapers and magazines to pay the entire cost of carriage through the mails. And that is not all. You have made it necessary to raise letter postage to 4 cents at least. Of course, these little matters will not interfere with the progress of this salary grab, but I am calling attention to them. There may be enough of us to compel roll calls on all these propositions, and of course you all want to be able to show by your record votes how generous you have been with the money entrusted to your care.

It already appears that people, on account of the 3-cent letter postage, are economizing in the matter of mailing letters—and the extra 1 cent will only bring into our war funds \$50,000,000 per year. We pay the expense of the Postal Service out of the sale of stamps, and if you add to the expenses of this department \$130,000,000 per year, and if an increase of 1 cent only brings in \$50,000,000, you can see that when these charges you are making to-day become effective even an additional 3 cents

is a possibility, and unless the war ends soon the 6-cent letter postage rate is in sight during the period of the war, with a possible reduction to 5 cents when the war ends.

In order to get at the Treasury of the United States in this magnificent and apparently successful raid you have suspended the rules of the House—you have overruled the decisions of the Chairman, clearly based on all the precedents, in order to give to thousands of clerks and letter carriers in first and second class post offices each an ultimate salary of \$1,500 per year, and in order to give every railway postal clerk an ultimate salary of \$2,000 a year. The farmers you are taxing to do this have an average annual income of less than \$700 per year, and the wage earners you are taxing have an average annual income of considerably less even than that. But, of course, little considerations of this character ought not to interfere with the generous motives which inspire so many of you to-day. I am sorry to have interrupted the hilarity which prevails here this afternoon—on with the raid on the Treasury; let joy be absolutely unconfined. In France they celebrate the anniversary of the day when the Bastille fell—we ought to celebrate hereafter the anniversary of this day on which the Treasury falls before your courageous, magnificent advance. At some time in the future the taxpayers upon whom you are placing these burdens may also organize—but I ought not to call attention to such an unpleasant possibility.

The raid you successfully pulled off two or three days ago, when you added \$120 per year to the salary of over 240,000 clerical employees, will cost the country over \$30,000,000 per year. The raid you are pulling off to-day will cost \$130,000,000 per year. The minimum wage bill when it passes will cost another \$50,000,000 per year. For the aggregate amount of these three items you could build every year 15 great battle-ships, and this would mean that in three or four years we would be invincible upon the seas and would be able to command the peace of the world. But, of course, this is also a matter which ought not to be mentioned on the present joyful occasion. Even after your magnificent victory of to-day something may happen to keep this bill from becoming a law. Of course, nothing can be expected here, but some patriotic influence may yet intervene to protect the Treasury against the events of this day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended one minute, so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended one minute, for the purpose of asking him a question. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. I shall have to object.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, is the debate upon this amendment exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. There have been five minutes debate on each side, and more.

Mr. MOON. Is the debate exhausted on the amendment that is pending?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MOON. Let us have a vote on it.

Mr. BLACK. I want to amend the Tague amendment by adding to it a proviso—

Provided, That this shall not alter or modify the three classes of railway mail clerks as now provided by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLACK offers to amend the Tague amendment as follows: Add at the end of the Tague amendment:

"Provided further, That this shall not alter or modify the three classes of railway mail clerks as now provided by law."

Mr. BLACK. I think I understand what the gentleman from Massachusetts desires to accomplish by his amendment. It is, as I understand it, this: Under the pending bill grade No. 1, for instance, has been raised from \$900 to \$1,100, and so has each of the other grades been raised \$200 per annum; and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] intends that the Postmaster General shall place the \$900 man in the new grade No. 1 at \$1,100, and so on up the line, giving recognition to the new grades which have been established. But under the language of his amendment it might be construed as directing the Postmaster General to promote all railway mail clerks automatically one grade each year up to the \$2,000 grade. I have not been in favor of this new reclassification plan and have offered an amendment to strike it out and substitute percentage increases similar to the percentage increases proposed for other postal employees, but the House has refused to adopt my amendment and therefore I would not want to offer any obstruction

to these men going into the new grades which the House intends by the adoption of the new classification plan.

Under the law as it now exists, as pointed out by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], the grades of railway mail clerks are classified into three classes, namely, classes A, B, and C. It is not that way as to postal clerks and carriers, but it is as to railway mail clerks. I do not understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts intends to alter or modify the three classes—namely, A, B, C—but merely to put the railway mail clerks into the new grades which this bill will establish, and so I think the amendment ought to be adopted which I have offered to the Tague amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman cite the committee to the section of law wherein the railway mail clerks are divided into three classes?

Mr. BLACK. It is section 1549 of the Postal Laws and Regulations. I have stated the substance of it to the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will examine the phraseology of the Tague amendment, he will see that it is obligatory on the Postmaster General to promote the respective clerks up to the maximum salary.

Mr. BLACK. I do not think it would be that way with my amendment adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, there would not be any purpose in the classification.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; it would put the men in the new grades under the new salary basis which the House has adopted, but would not repeal the three classes, A, B, and C.

Mr. STAFFORD. The maximum salary in class B is \$1,500. Does the gentleman mean to say it would be \$2,000?

Mr. BLACK. No; I do not understand it that way.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what is the purpose of his amendment?

Mr. TAGUE. It is merely to have the different grades now fixed by law, previous to the passage of this act, go into the grades that are defined in the present bill. In other words, a man getting \$1,100 under the old law, under this bill would get \$1,300, and he would automatically go from \$1,300 to \$1,400 increase in the grade defined in this law.

Mr. MADDEN. In other words, if he was in class 1 at \$1,000 a year, he would remain in class 1 unless he was entitled to be promoted, and he would be increased in compensation \$200 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. The law would still restrict the salary of class A to \$1,200, class B to \$1,300, and class C to \$1,500. I want these clerks to receive a fair increase, but no such increase as provided in the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, where they all will be promoted automatically until they receive \$2,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TAGUE) there were—82 ayes and 42 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the figures "\$2,000," strike out the period and insert the following: "and chief clerks at \$2,250."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, as I am advised, there are 120 chief clerks to be affected by this amendment, should it pass.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say to the gentleman and to the House that the Post Office appropriation bill, passed in December, carried 6,400 promotions and included the men in the class referred to in the amendment he proposes. There is no necessity to have anything done for them in this bill, because they are already provided for.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois, I contend that every clerk in the Postal Department throughout the United States will get an increase of salary as provided by this bill and as provided by former appropriation bills, except 120 chief clerks, whose salary is not affected by either this bill or any other appropriation bill made at this session of Congress. There are 120 of them who will continue to receive \$2,100 a year. These men have a tremendously important duty to perform. The law has always recognized that their services were worth about

\$450 more than the services of the highest paid clerks under them. Under the law as it will stand after the bill is enacted their salary will be within \$100 of the highest paid clerks. If this amendment should pass, it will increase their salary only \$150. The increase is less than the increase of any other class of clerks. I submit to the fair consideration of this House that these 120 men have not received just treatment, if this amendment fails to carry.

Mr. Chairman, I want to turn from this amendment that I have introduced to say a word concerning other features of this bill. Uncle Sam is the biggest and richest employer of labor in the United States. We boast for him the distinction of being the most kind and generous of all who have entered into the field of labor employment. I am sorry that statements in his praise are not always true. The Federal Government in this connection in too many instances is neither kind, just, nor generous in dealing with those who are called upon to do its work in the various fields of Federal endeavor. In many instances there has been no increase of either salary or wages in many years, yet within that time the cost of living has so far increased until to-day this inflated cost has depreciated the value of a dollar at least one-half, and in many instances the purchasing power is even less than one-half. The private employer of labor has taken this into account long ago, and the wage of those in private activities has been materially increased, perhaps not to the point of absolute justice, but the increase has been a material one. This is not true of public employment. [Applause.]

However, there is a ray of hope struggling through the clouds for those who are in the service of the Government. The Congress of the United States at last has awakened to the fact that these thousands of poorly paid men and women shall come into a part, at least, of their just reward for a long and faithful service. A few days ago a bill passed this House carrying increase of salaries for department clerks in Washington. Every bill of this nature has had my earnest support, because it seems to me but justice. I shall vote for the pending bill with only one regret, and that is the increase of pay to some of these faithful employees of our great Postal System is not enough. I would like to see a greater increase than this bill provides be given to each carrier of rural mails. Remember these men out of their present pay must either own or hire at least two horses and a conveyance for the entire working year. If he owns this team and conveyance, or whether he does not, we must not fail to take into account the original cost to him or some one else and couple that with the fact that there is a constant cost of the everyday upkeep, with prices of feed increasing from month to month so rapidly that I do not even know the cost of hay and oats and corn and straw to-day. I do know, however, the cost is three and maybe four times that of only a short period back. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it may be that the carrier has provided himself with a motor vehicle in order that he speed up the delivery of mail to anxious patrons who await his daily arrival hoping for tidings from a son or brother now in trench or camp. If so, his outlay for gasoline, tires, and repairs amounts to fabulous sums in comparison with his meager wage. Neither has the high cost of living in its sweep of the country missed this class of workers for Uncle Sam. Before this class of men can buy their living necessities when their pay check comes, they must first take care of the upkeep bills, and when this is done there is such a little left that in many instances their families are in want. This ought never to be said truthfully of the employees of the greatest Government upon the face of the earth. [Applause.]

Confronted with all these facts there are some who reject the demands of postal clerks and carriers for a living wage on the ground of public economy. I want economy, and rigid economy, in the expenditure of public funds, but not the economy, so called, that makes our Government mean and miserly. Not the economy that withholds from those who perform an honest service a just reward. Not the economy that will stunt and dwarf the children of these carriers of the mail. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS: Page 2, line 13, insert as new paragraph the following:

"Clerks, carriers, and railway postal clerks who are detailed to serve in a foreign country shall, during the period of their foreign service, receive a salary 20 per cent in excess of that herein provided for the grade to which they belong."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, and I am very glad that I shall have an opportunity to vote for it in the near future.

I have offered the amendment which has just been read in order to give a 20 per cent bonus to the men who are being sent to France by the postal authorities to deliver the mail to the soldiers who are now with the American Expeditionary Forces. Our soldiers receive an increase of 20 per cent in their pay for foreign service. My suggestion is that somewhat the same considerations which make it proper to increase the pay of the soldier when he is overseas make it proper to increase the pay of the postal employee when he is overseas.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Is it not a fact that these men who were sent over there get extra pay?

Mr. ROGERS. The only extra pay that they receive, as I understand it, is a very small allowance for commutation of quarters and rations. I think all they so receive is \$2.50 a day, both for board and lodging, which will probably prove less than their actual and necessary expenses. I want to call the attention of the House to a statement which was cabled from France by the Associated Press three or four days ago, and which was published throughout the United States in the press. The Associated Press dispatch says in part:

BAKER'S ARRIVAL SPURS AMERICANS AT FRONT AND IN CAMP TO ACTIVITY—"OLD MAN WILL FIND US READY WHENEVER HE COMES," MEN SAY—MAIL DELAYS CAUSE WORRY.

[By the Associated Press.]

WITH THE AMERICAN ARMY IN FRANCE,
Tuesday, March 12.

In Army circles there is general gratification over the coming of Mr. Baker, in order that he may see at close hand what has been accomplished thus far in the face of the obstacles and the difficulties of distance, and especially the moral and physical condition of the troops, so that he may carry home a personal knowledge of easily remedied deficiencies and complaints.

DELAY OF MAIL SERIOUS.

The most serious of the deficiencies and complaints surround the Army mail service. Everywhere the rank and file complain of the absence or great delay in mail from home.

Company officers generally say the mail problem is one of the most serious they have to contend with, because the men become lonely and anxious in the absence of word from their families. The ordinary mails are from one month to six weeks ahead of the Army mails, and the officers express the belief that there would be no better factor for the happiness of the men than the most expeditious mail service it is possible to devise—even a faster service than through the ordinary civilian channels.

If this article is to be believed—and I think we shall agree that an Associated Press dispatch is always intended to represent the fact and does not display any partisan prejudice or bias—it appears that the ordinary civilian mails to France are from one month to six weeks ahead of the Army mail. A friend here in Washington has just told me of his experience. He received yesterday a reply to a letter which he wrote a civilian member of his family in Paris 35 days ago. The letter had traveled from Washington to its destination in Paris and the answer had been written and returned to him in Washington, all in 35 days. Members of this House know that the average time that the soldiers' mail would take for the round trip would be from two to three times as long. I submit that if there is to be any distinction between the civilian mail and the soldier mail it ought all to be in favor of an expeditious delivery to the soldiers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman advised as to what the scale of pay is for the postal employees connected with the delivery of mails in France?

Mr. ROGERS. My understanding is that they receive the pay of their grade in this country and an allowance for food and quarters.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the gentleman's understanding. Does he know whether that is the fact?

Mr. ROGERS. That is my information.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the employees doing service in connection with the Auditor for the War Department are paid much more liberal salaries for service abroad out of lump-sum appropriations than they receive in this country, and I rose to ascertain information as to whether a similar system does not prevail with respect to the postal employees over there?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I want to say that without information upon the subject of what the policy of the Postal Department is with respect to the pay of these men abroad I do not think we ought to adopt any amendment of any kind to this bill on this proposition, because no one knows what the department is doing. It is not fair to adopt the amendment without information. We have not the information, and we are not going to be able to get it, and I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, my time has expired. As an argument has just been made in my time in opposition to my amendment I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman understand how these men who have gone to France are paid?

Mr. ROGERS. My information is they are paid the amount of the grade which they carry in this country.

Mr. MOON. Well, they are paid in addition all their expenses.

Mr. ROGERS. I have stated that it is my understanding that they are paid \$2.50 per day for rations and lodging.

Mr. MOON. No man goes over except upon his own request.

Mr. ROGERS. That is true. Most of our soldiers in France are volunteers. Is that to their discredit?

Mr. MADDEN. Hundreds are making applications to go.

Mr. ROGERS. And hundreds are making applications because they want to render patriotic service in connection with Army work on the other side.

Mr. MADDEN. If a man has a home and can stay at home, and wants to take this salary and go to France and get the additional pay furnished for such service, why is it the gentleman wants to increase the salary of a man after he has gone over without any intimation on the part of the Post Office Department as to its necessity?

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman did not apply that argument when the pay of soldiers who went to France was very properly increased because of their over-seas service. I think that many of the postal men who volunteered to go over to France are moved by just the same patriotic motive as that which actuated the soldiers.

Postmaster General Burleson, in response to House resolution 232, which I introduced and which was adopted by the House, said (H. Doc. No. 892) under date of January 31, 1918:

The time required to transmit postal matter from the United States to the members of the American expeditionary force in France has been found to be from 15 to 30 days.

Every soldier in our forces and every wife and mother of every soldier knows that Postmaster General Burleson had been misinformed when he made this statement. Of course it was difficult to cooperate with the Post Office Department in securing an improvement in the service when the Postmaster General has officially stated that the service was unimprovable. Lately I am glad to observe a modification of this rather uncompromising attitude. The Second Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Praeger, recently admitted the delays before the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but attributed them to the Army and not to his own department.

Mr. Praeger, who is in charge of over-seas mail, testified before the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads on February 13. A statement has recently been printed in the Official Bulletin of March 16, which is described as a "statement given out by the Post Office Department," and which presumably emanates officially from Mr. Praeger's office. These two sources, taken together, refute absolutely and definitely the sweeping indorsement by Mr. Burleson of the mail service. They show that the delays which everyone recognizes, but which the Postmaster General denies, are attributable to at least five causes.

DELAY 1.

Permit me to quote the language of the testimony:

Mr. PRAEGER. The mail at these terminals—

Referring to the terminals in New York City and Chicago—

is distributed without any information from the War Department. We don't know how to make up the mail except by the fact that letters are coming in for this unit or for that unit. Out of that we build up, day by day, a new section, showing that there are new troops there because there is mail arriving.

In the Navy we handle the mail for the entire naval forces, but the Navy furnishes us by telegram or by radio a change in the shift of its ships on the day they take place. The Army gives us no information whatever, as, I assume, it is a military necessity to hold it secret. So all we can do is to make up all the mail we receive for Company A, of the — Infantry, in one sack, and label it so. (Praeger hearings, p. 114.)

DELAY 2.

Mr. PRAEGER. After the mail is made up in the New York office and put in a sealed bag addressed to the company we have two ways of sending it. One is by the French liners. They are running very irregularly—sometimes 14 days, sometimes 18, and we have known it to be longer, nearly a month, between the arrival and departure of French liners. They used to have enough ships to operate, I think, a semi-weekly service. Then when the war broke out it got to be weekly service. Now they run irregularly. We have had intermissions of two weeks frequently between sailings of those French liners.

Our other source is to send it on the transports. We can send on the transports mail only to such an extent as the embarkation officers will permit to go aboard. We can not control it. They are to tell us how much mail they can take and when they will take it. They will send, say, for example, 3,000 sacks at noon to-morrow or 1,000 sacks at noon to-morrow. We may have waiting eight or ten thousand sacks, but 3,000 sacks are all that they will take. (Praeger hearings, p. 116.)

DELAY 3.

Mr. PRAEGER. That mail, arriving in France at one of the ports, is dispatched by a post-office official, who is furnished, confidentially, by the Army there with the location of all the units in France. That information from the Army to the postal authorities has heretofore been uniformly 8 to 10 days after the unit is finally settled in its location. Sometimes it is longer and sometimes a little faster, but not very frequently. (Praeger hearings, p. 116.)

Mr. Praeger has recently told me personally that all mail for the New England troops was, early in the year, held up and undelivered for several weeks, because the military authorities would not tell the postal authorities of the new location of these troops.

DELAY 4—WAITS FOR DAYS ON CARS.

The mail that is unloaded from the ships must frequently wait days at the port before cars can be spared from the heavily burdened railroads in France to move the mail.

When the United States Army Postal Service was first inaugurated, mail reached all of the camps in the country in one to two days, according to distance and train connections. To-day mail, by reason of its vast volume and the heavy demands on the railroads, frequently takes six days to reach Gen. Pershing's headquarters. (Official Bulletin, Mar. 16.)

DELAY 5.

Mr. PRAEGER. When one unit moves from this section, or from this section to that section, the Army will not give us in all cases that information maybe within 10, 12, or 15 days. Meanwhile the mail continues to go to the old place. (Praeger hearings, p. 116.)

There may be, and doubtless are, other sources of delay. I confine myself solely to those which are of official record. Of course, all these delays can not be eliminated, but I can not believe all are incapable of improvement. Mr. Praeger sums up thus what seems to be the fundamental difficulty:

I know that we could give a greatly improved service if the War Department's idea of what constitutes military necessity and secrecy were liberalized. But we are entirely subject to their direction in every step that we take, and wherever their idea of secrecy conflicts with our service we must give in. (Praeger hearings, pp. 121, 122.)

So, in spite of Mr. Burleson's statement, there are delays.

Very likely, Mr. Praeger's "passing of the buck" is justified. I do not know. No one can find out. Assuming it to be well founded, is there any adequate military reason? Can not the War Department trust the Post Office Department and give instantly the information concerning movements of troops which will promote prompt delivery? Can not complete coordination be attained? Great Britain has no such fear or reluctance. In a previous speech I have told the House in detail how Great Britain has systematized her mail service and how soldiers in the front-line trenches receive London letters the day following their mailing, and mail from the most remote parts of the British Isles within 48 hours.

France and Germany also lay the greatest stress on prompt and reliable mail service to their soldiers. It is not with them a matter of sentiment; it is a matter of morale and of urgent military necessity.

To show the importance of the mental well-being of the soldiers if an army's efficiency is to be kept at its height, a recent statement by Lieut. Gen. Baron von Ardenne, one of Germany's foremost military commentators, is of interest. This article appeared in the Berliner Tageblatt of January 4, and was reprinted in the New York Times of March 17:

If, however, the things pertaining to the material field have a high importance, those which are not to strengthen the stomach but the heart and mind have one much higher. First in importance among these are the consciousness of victory, the faith in the supreme army command, and, not least, the confidence that the folks at home share the interests and hopes of the army. Good news from other battle fields flashes through the troops like an electric shock. For instance, what enthusiasm was raised alternately by the news of the double battles of Worth and Saarbrücken in 1870 among the armies marching separately! And so the French attack in the Aisne-Champagne Battle of April, 1917, was so extraordinarily powerful because previously the news had been spread among the troops of the victory of the English at Arras and the declaration of war upon Germany by America. Indescribable was the enthusiasm of our fighters in Flanders when they received the news of our victories in Italy and the conclusion of the armistice with Russia.

WARNING AGAINST PESSIMISM.

The mental life of the army is extraordinarily sensitive and is particularly receptive to the changes of feeling at home. Those at home are to be expressly warned against any expressions of pessimism. And vice versa, reports of the abuse of German prisoners by our enemies are to be avoided. These reports have filled many a heart at home with anxious care, which has then come back to the front. The German Army command does not need these complaints to cause it to adopt the measures necessary to improve the lot of our poor prisoners. That among the other mental imponderables the army mail service, that carries the news from house and farm, from wife and child, from town and city, occupies first place is known to everybody who understands the depths of the German soul. That gifts sent from home at Christmas time possess a much higher charm than usual is shown by the warm thanks of those who receive them.

The contact with the fatherland has the effect of something mysterious, something holy. When our divisions roll through the broad German Empire on their journeys from one border to the other the railroad trip of several days is a rich source of strength and of confident consciousness of victory.

The plight of our boys is in at least one respect worse than that of the French, the British, or the German soldiers.

French, British, and German soldiers are enabled to go to their homes on furlough every few months. Our boys will not return to the United States until the end of the war. There is no shipping to carry them and they could not be spared if there were. The letter is the only link with home. Let us have that link perfected.

Surely, in the light of the experience of other armies, it can not be that the Army should not give every aid to the swiftest possible deliveries of mail to the soldiers. Every member of the overseas force, high in rank or low in rank, is eager, nay restless, for an improvement. I am glad that Secretary Baker is to learn for himself its importance. The country will not long tolerate a lack of coordination in a matter of this extreme moment.

I have no personal grievance in this matter. I have no desire to attack or embarrass any department of the Government or any individual. My purpose is to be constructive and not destructive. But I deeply deplore the hopeless inadequacy in the Postal Service to France, of which I learned when I was on the spot in December and which the Associated Press dispatch indicates has not improved in the last three months.

No one can deny that civilian mail to France is far swifter than soldier mail.

Why should our soldiers in France be discriminated against? The message from home—the news that the wife and the mother are well—is of the essence in our Army's morale. This is not a matter of sentiment merely but a vital military necessity. Let us temporize no longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to observe only that this amendment certainly does not appeal to the intelligence and good sense of this House on a question of this sort and I am not going to argue it at all. If the House is in the humor to pass any more legislation along that line in addition to what it has already I hope we may rise soon and wait until Monday for something else.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What is the present status of business before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. A discussion of the Rogers amendment.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Has debate been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. It has; but the Chair has recognized the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure as to the merit in the amendment for the proposed increase in pay of the postal employees in foreign service. What I want to call to the attention of the House is the fact that the Postal Service is very deficient so far as the service to the soldiers is concerned. It takes months for a letter to reach a soldier from his parents and it takes months to receive a letter from the soldier to the parents. It is important that this service be immediately improved. The morale of the soldier depends upon how he feels. He is always anxious to hear from home. He wants to hear from his mother and father, his sister, his brother. He wants to hear how things are going on in the farm, in the shop, in the factory, in the mill, in his place of business; if he is a married man he wants to know how his wife and children are, and if he has a sweetheart he wants to hear from her. The courage of the man on the morning of the battle depends largely upon the news from home. If the letter came and was full of cheer the soldier will be fit for the hardest trial of physical and moral courage. The boys ought to get a letter from home once a week. That letter ought to contain nothing that would distress the soldier. It ought to contain no bad news. He ought not even to fear bad news. He ought to have nothing but encouragement from home—

news that everything is all right; and, I repeat, he should have a letter from home at least once a week. I would, if I could, get that suggestion into every home that has a soldier on the front. If a young man without relatives has gone from any community some one should write him a good cheery letter to show him that there is an interest in him. It will help him do his best in the camp, at the front, and in the trenches. Now, if the Postal Service over there needs additional men, or if those men need additional pay both should be provided in order that this service may be rendered to the soldiers who are in the trenches and behind the trenches and serving on the front and in the camps and cantonments. It is important to the country that the soldier should feel that he has encouragement from home, as important that he know that everything is well at home on the morning of the battle as to know that his arms and ammunition are in good condition.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman be willing to take my word that everything that can be done to adjust the disposition, delivery, and transportation, and all that, of the mail is being done, so that there will be no complaint in the near future about it? I happen to know the details of the work that is being done, and I want to say this of the Postmaster General and those in charge, that there is not a thing that can be done that is not being done to get that mail service out of the chaotic condition it has been in. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am glad that is so. It has taken a long, long time.

Now, I wish the relatives, friends, and sweethearts of every soldier in the service would write to him once a week. It should be done.

Mr. Chairman, this bill with the increases provided should pass. Then the law should be so administered as to pay the increases provided for. It will greatly aid in restoring the Postal Service to its former efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOBECK: Page 2, line 13, after the figures "\$2,000," insert:

"Provided, That railway postal clerks that have been heretofore transferred, or may be transferred hereafter, to terminal post offices shall be paid the same salaries as had been paid them before such transfer, and the clerks so transferred shall not be lowered in grade by reason of such transfer."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I make the point of order. This is a question of salary increase and not a question of classification.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order, then.

Mr. MADDEN. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman be heard. I will not argue it. I reserve it.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, this is not raising salaries. Men have been transferred from the railway mail post office on trains to the terminal stations, and their salaries have been lowered. They have been demoted. I know men that have given many years of service, who were in grades of \$1,400, \$1,500, \$1,600, and \$1,700, and who have been ordered to go to work for the Postmaster General or his department for \$1,200 in the railway terminal offices. The reason why the Postmaster General and his department have said they did not pay them more than \$1,200 was that they did not pay the clerks in the local post offices more than \$1,200, and that these men should not receive more. So, it has been a demotion by order of the Postmaster General, and it is not fair to the men who have given years of service in the Railway Mail Service that they should be transferred on an order, and then deliberately have their salaries lowered on an order. And they ought to be entitled to the same that they have been getting, or, if transferred hereafter, should have the same salary in the terminals that they had on the railways. I do not see where it is an increase of salary.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman want to be heard?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that this is a bill to increase the compensation of the employees in

the Postal Service and not a bill to regulate the administrative side of the Postal Service. The amendment offered by my friend from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK] seeks to direct the Postmaster General as to how he shall conduct the business of the service.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule unless the gentleman wants to be heard. The Chair believes the amendment is in order and overrules the point of order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for a moment on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In opposition to it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. Unless some gentleman objects, I would like to be heard for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will give this matter due consideration. There is no provision that is contained in this bill that is more important, if the House wishes to do justice at this time to a very worthy class of our railway mail operatives.

Before I go any further I want to say that I approve the bill as a whole, and especially that part which raises the salaries of the rural carriers, who have been working for the past year or more under circumstances so onerous as to be fairly heart-breaking. The expense of the upkeep of their equipment alone has in many cases absorbed the greater part of their salaries. Hay and feed of all kinds have risen "out of sight," and the prospect is for higher rather than lower prices for the ensuing year. Only employees of the most faithful character, who took not merely an interest but a pride in their work, would have stuck to their jobs under such trying circumstances.

Now, as showing the propriety of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK], let me explain the situation. The terminal post offices were created at railway terminals, where large quantities of the mail are transferred and is assorted while being held, thereby saving time and enabling the sorting to be done quicker and easier. The plan was an excellent one, for it enabled the mail to be forwarded more expeditiously, saved space on the trains, and saved work; in short, it made for efficiency and economy, and I congratulate the Post Office Department on its adoption. Here, however, my congratulations must end. It necessitated taking many clerks off the trains and putting them in the terminals. This change was necessary and proper, but there was no reason why their salaries should have thereby been lowered, but, on the contrary, every reason why they should have remained as before. The clerks were just as efficient as before—in fact, accomplished more work. The experience and knowledge which they had gained by long practice entitled them to a raise rather than a cut when so transferred.

The law heretofore enacted has been evaded. It was not the intention when provision was made for the transfer of these employees from the Railway Mail Service to the terminal post offices that any of them should be lowered in salary, and a provision was inserted in a former statute which was intended to prevent this being done. That provision has been plowed around by giving the clerks transferred the choice of taking some out-of-the-way route which would remove them from their homes or accepting a position in the terminals at a lower salary.

Now, if the House desires that these railway mail employees who, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK] has stated, have given the best years of their lives to the service, perfecting themselves in the service of the Government, should not be demoted, contrary to the spirit of the law as it now stands, this amendment ought to prevail. I believe that this will put a stop to this practice that the House endeavored to put a stop to in former years, but failed, so far as I am informed.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DILL. I want to say that I have had two instances of that in my own town, in my own district, in the last two months, where that has been done.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And the gentleman agrees with me?

Mr. DILL. Yes. I think it is a very important amendment.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman think the Postmaster General would pay any attention to it if we passed it here?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This amendment is very explicit. Its terms are clear and unmistakable, and it would take care not

only of the cases which may arise in the future, but of those which happened in the past.

I am sorry that the House seems to be impatient as the hour grows late and to be inclined to vote down all amendments now offered regardless of their merits. I know that it is desirable to finish the bill to-day, if possible, but we ought to do justice, no matter how long we sit. These terminal clerks who have been taken from the trains are the only class out of all the great body of Government employees whose wages have actually been reduced, and we will not do justice to them unless we restore them to their former grades and salaries before we make the increase and prevent in the future their salaries being lowered by reason of transfer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. LOBECK. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 36, nays 56.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks for tellers. All those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] One gentleman has risen—not a sufficient number. Tellers are refused. So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS: Page 2, line 2, after the word "city," insert the words "and village."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer is to raise the pay of village carriers, and I submit that it is not subject to a point of order. I want the attention of the committee to this amendment, which I regard as a meritorious one and one offered in all good faith.

This amendment is designed to raise the pay of village carriers. The pay of the city-delivery carriers is provided for in this section, and this amendment proposes to put, after the word "city" and before the word "delivery," in line 2, page 2, the words "and village," so that the section will read "carriers in the city and village delivery service."

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. We have no such municipal organization as "village" in Pennsylvania. The organizations there are boroughs, townships, and counties. I do not know what you have in Oklahoma. "Village" would not mean anything with us.

Mr. HASTINGS. In answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I will say that they are classed as village-delivery carriers.

Mr. EMERSON. In the Post Office Department?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes. Here is the distinction: In cities where the postal receipts are more than \$10,000, those who deliver the mails are called "city-delivery carriers," but in any city where the receipts are under \$10,000 that service is called the "village-delivery service." Now, those who are engaged in the village-delivery service, let me say to the members of the committee, receive the sum of \$50 a month, which, I think, was increased last year \$5 a month, so that they now receive, as I am advised by the Post Office Department, \$660 per annum.

The village-delivery carriers render practically the same service that the city-delivery carriers render. They have the same responsibilities and they perform the same duties, and if this amendment is adopted it will permit the increase of those performing village-delivery service up to the class of those who perform city-delivery service. In other words, the minimum amount that the city-delivery carriers receive under the terms of this bill, if enacted, will be \$1,000, and the village-delivery carriers will receive a like amount.

Now, for the information of the committee—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. In just a minute; then I will be glad to. There are 498 cities in the United States that have this village delivery service, and there are 715 such carriers in the United States; and, as I said a moment ago, these carriers receive a maximum of \$660 per annum.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman has just answered the question I was going to ask him. I wanted to find out how many villages had such service.

Mr. HASTINGS. Four hundred and ninety-eight in the United States, as I am advised by the Post Office Department; and there are 715 village-delivery carriers. Some villages have only one carrier, some have two.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will be glad to.

Mr. MOON. What does the gentleman say about the point of order?

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not think it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MOON. I am inclined to think that it is. The section to which this amendment is offered is for the increase of pay for postal clerks and city carriers in the classified service. The gentleman proposes, as I understand it, to increase the pay of the clerks in the village deliveries. The village delivery is an experimental proposition purely. These clerks are paid by the postmaster in the village out of a lump-sum allowance allowed by the Post Office Department purely as an experiment. I will say to the Chair that I do not think it is in order, because of these reasons. It does not pertain to the classified service, and that is what we are considering.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Tennessee, let me say that the village-delivery service is past the experimental stage. It was inaugurated some time ago. In the year 1912—some six years ago—it was inaugurated, and it has been extended throughout the United States, until the service is now in 498 villages.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman is mistaken about that. There is not enough appropriation to go one-tenth over the country. There are only two small appropriations made for it, as an experimental proposition. I think the whole appropriation now is less than half a million dollars.

Mr. HASTINGS. I have the figures given me by the Post Office Department to the effect that the service has been extended to 498 villages throughout the United States. I am not mistaken. These figures were given me by the department.

Mr. MOON. That is not one-tenth of them.

Mr. ROUSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. ROUSE. I want to ask the gentleman if his amendment should be held in order would he be willing to advance the men to the sixth and eighth grades?

Mr. HASTINGS. The question of the advance of the men would be left to the Post Office Department.

Mr. ROUSE. If the amendment is agreed to in that particular section, would it not be mandatory?

Mr. HASTINGS. No; as I interpret it, they would go into the first grade and receive \$1,000.

Mr. ROUSE. And the next year they would be advanced, and so on, each year.

Mr. HASTINGS. They would be entitled to be advanced, of course, under the law and regulations of the department. I think these people ought to receive more than \$660 per annum.

Mr. ROUSE. Does the gentleman think they ought to receive \$1,500?

Mr. HASTINGS. No; I think that is too high, and they would not get it for five or six years. By that time they would be promoted to other branches of the service, city carriers or clerks in larger offices.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Are the village carriers in the classified service?

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not understand that they are, but they can be covered into the classified service by the department. That should not determine their compensation. Those who perform this service are now underpaid.

This bill provides for an increase in the pay of rural carriers. A rural carrier on a standard route of 24 miles receives \$1,200 per annum. This bill would increase his compensation 20 per cent, or \$240 per annum, and add \$24 per mile to his yearly salary for each additional mile his route may extend over 24 miles. I think the increase is justified in each case. These carriers perform a very important service.

In this connection it might be interesting to recall that Congress by the act of March 3, 1893, appropriated \$10,000 to experiment with rural mail delivery, but the money was not used. Another appropriation of \$20,000 was made by the act of June 16, 1894, but was not used. A third appropriation was made on June 9, 1896, of \$10,000. The first experimental service was established on October 1, 1896, when three routes were started in West Virginia. The service was rapidly expanded

until we now have more than 43,000 rural routes throughout the United States, for which we appropriate annually more than \$53,000,000.

These carriers must provide themselves with horses and bugles or automobiles. They must buy feed for their horses or gasoline for their machines. All these supplies were secured at extraordinarily high prices during the past few years. For all their other equipment and supplies they must pay exceptionally high prices. I regard the increase of \$240 per year as reasonable and just. It is fair and not disproportionate to their increased expenditures, which present war conditions cause. For this reason I voted for the amendment to increase the pay of rural carriers from 15 to 20 per cent per annum.

The bill provides an increase for city letter carriers of approximately \$200 per annum, and for an increase in the salaries of railway postal clerks. I think both increases are justified and am glad to support them.

Section 2 provides for an increase in pay to assistant postmasters in first and second class post offices, departmental clerks, and post-office clerks, laborers, watchmen, printers, chauffeurs, messengers, charwomen, janitors in post offices, and per diem employees, and all other postal employees not enumerated in section 1. Where their annual compensation is less than \$800 the increase is 20 per cent; where it is in excess of \$800 and not more than \$1,200, the increase is 15 per cent; and where it is between \$1,200 and \$1,800, the increase is 10 per cent. This increase ought to be extended to third-class offices. I understand that an amendment is to be offered so as to include post offices of the third class, and I shall be glad to give it my support.

In section 3 of the bill an increase in pay for offices of the fourth class is provided. Fourth-class postmasters and clerks in third-class post offices perform more service and get less compensation in proportion to the work done and the responsibility placed upon them, in my judgment, than any other employees of the Government. I am very glad, indeed, to support the amendment which will be proposed to increase the pay of employees in the third-class offices, as I am glad to support this provision of the bill for additional pay for fourth-class postmasters, giving them 100 per cent of the cancellations on the first \$100 or less per quarter, instead of the first \$50 or less per quarter.

Section 6 of the bill authorizes the Postmaster General to conduct experiments in the operation of motor-vehicle truck routes in the vicinity of such cities of the United States as he may select, and for this experimental purpose he is authorized to use not to exceed \$300,000. This is a very important experiment, both to the residents of the cities and towns and the farmers who live in the vicinity of the routes. I predict that as in the case of the rural-route service this truck service will be greatly expanded in the near future, and will enable farmers and truck growers to supply customers regularly at a minimum cost of delivery, resulting in a greatly reduced cost of vegetables, poultry, and dairy products to consumers and a better market for truck growers and farmers. I think it is a splendid provision and am glad to give it my support. I want to invite the earnest attention of everyone to it.

Section 7 provides for the transportation of mails by aeroplanes and authorizes the Secretary of War to turn over to the Postmaster General for the use of the Postal Service such aeroplanes and automobiles, or parts thereof, as may become from time to time unsuitable or unnecessary for the purposes of the War Department. When this war is over a very large number of aeroplanes will be available for the Postal Service. The time is not far distant when nearly all the mail between the larger cities will be carried by aeroplanes. The mail will be delivered much more quickly, because of the elimination of indirect routes and the great speed of aeroplanes. Approximately but one-third of the time now required by mail trains will be needed for this new service.

Within a short time after the close of the war aeroplanes will be in general use in the mail service. This service will first connect the larger cities and gradually extend to the smaller cities. Aeroplanes passing overhead will become so common as to attract scarcely any notice.

While we are providing for experiments along these lines and for increases in salaries of other employees in the Postal Service we should not neglect to do justice to the employees in the village-delivery service. I earnestly hope that the amendment offered by me will receive favorable consideration and be adopted. I am sure it is not subject to a point of order, and the justness of it should commend itself to the Members of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard briefly on the point of order. I do not care to take more than one minute. It seems to me that the point of order is not well taken, and for this reason: I do not know that I

am willing to vote for the amendment. I am inclined to think that I would be compelled to vote against it, but I do believe that it is in order on the bill. Here is a bill which not only increases the compensation to numerous classes of postal employees throughout the United States, but it changes existing law in respect to gradation of those employees. The bill extends provisions not only to city carriers but to rural free-delivery carriers, the railway post-office employees, and to a great variety. As was stated a moment ago, it aims to take care of the postal employees out in the field away from Washington. It is broad and comprehensive. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Oklahoma would extend this provision to one further class, namely, to the carriers in the villages. Now, the fact that these carriers are in an experimental stage has no bearing on the question. They are employees for this department. They are drawing a regular compensation on a regular salary basis.

Mr. MOON. What is the compensation?

Mr. HASTINGS. Six hundred dollars is the maximum.

Mr. MOON. They are not all paid the same.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That would not make any difference.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is the inquiry I made of the Post Office Department.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. This bill changes the grade, status, and compensation of all kinds and descriptions of post-office employees throughout the United States. This amendment adds one more class to many classes; therefore, under the rules of the House it is germane.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield? I should like to get his views on this point, if he will yield.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am perfectly willing to yield.

Mr. COX. The bill under consideration deals exclusively with employees in the civil service. The class of employees that the gentleman seeks to bring in by his amendment are not under the civil service.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That may be an incident, but it is not the basis of this bill. The basis of this bill is to deal with classes of postal employees, and it may be argued that they are all under the civil service; but this bill is not framed to affect only those under the civil service.

My attention has also been called to the fact that some of those affected here are not under the civil service, namely, the star route carriers and a great variety of others.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the gentleman that there is possibly a section of this bill under which this might be in order, but I think it is very clear that it is not in order on this section.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am quite confident that it is.

Mr. MOON. This deals exclusively with the classified service and the automatic promotions in that service.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If it is in order anywhere in the bill, I submit to the gentleman that it is in order here.

Mr. MOON. No; it is not in order here.

Mr. RANDALL. The village carriers are under the civil service, where they are employed at third-class offices which are under the civil service.

Mr. COX. I beg the gentleman's pardon. These village carriers are not under the civil service.

Mr. RANDALL. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have a case in my own district now where a village carrier must take the civil-service examination before he is appointed.

Mr. COX. There is no regulation providing for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes the amendment is germane, and the point of order is overruled. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALDOW. I move to strike out the last word.

I am heartily in favor of this bill, but I favor a larger increase to those employees now receiving less than \$1,800. However, this is a step in the right direction, and I hope we will be able to complete and pass this bill to-day. The 15 per cent increase and \$24 per mile for each additional mile over 24 miles for the rural free-delivery carriers is a provision that is badly needed by this class of employees, and this should be amended to read \$30 per mile for all routes exceeding 20 miles. While it is true all other employees of the Postal Service are deserving of increased compensation to meet the advanced cost of living, the rural carriers have the increased cost of upkeep and maintenance of their horses and vehicles to provide for in addition to their own increase in the cost of living.

I have received statements from many of the carriers of my district showing the cost of maintenance of their equipment necessary for proper and satisfactory service. One carrier from

North Collins, Erie County, N. Y., spent \$835 during the past year, leaving him \$365, or just \$1 per day to exist on. Another carrier of the town of Hamburg, Erie County, N. Y., expended all but \$358.20 of his salary in the upkeep and maintenance of his equipment necessary for satisfactory service. Another carrier from the town of Gardenville, Erie County, N. Y., expended all but \$483.75 for the maintenance of his equipment necessary for proper and satisfactory service. While I believe all the men in the mail service that this bill affects are entitled to added compensation, I believe the rural carrier has had the greatest burdens to bear during the past few years. I hope that part of this bill limiting this increase to 90 days after the war will be eliminated. Congress should not assume that the cost of living and maintenance of equipment will be decreased immediately after the war, and if such should be the case Congress can then enact legislation to meet the condition at that time.

I sincerely hope that Senate amendment 2718 will be adopted, for I believe the economic distribution and transportation of farm products from the farmer to the consumer is one of the most vital questions this Congress must consider.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the Members of this Congress to what I consider outrageous treatment of the people of the rural sections of my district by virtue of the order of Mr. Burleson changing and rerouting almost every mail route in that section. He has not only enlarged many of the routes so that it is utterly impossible for any person to cover them in the fall, winter, or early spring, and I have received hundreds of complaints and have protested in vain to the Postmaster General. Many of my complainants inform me that their mail is delayed three, four, and five days. Some of them do not receive it at all, unless they make a special trip to their post office. But by this changing of the routes he has practically wiped towns off of the map, in so far as they may be recognized by their post-office addresses, and I believe his petty policy of economy, irrespective of the public's welfare, has been the means of creating more dissatisfaction, more confusion, in my section of the country than all the excuses he or the heads of his department can offer in explanation for the 90 per cent of inefficiency that now exists in the Post Office Department.

Mr. Chairman, I have a bill in the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads asking for an investigation of the deplorable conditions as they exist in my section of the country, and I hope the committee will grant me a hearing upon the same as soon as possible. The conditions in my county have become so deplorable the board of supervisors found it necessary to pass resolutions condemning the action of the Post Office Department. [Applause.]

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DALLINGER: Page 2, line 3, after the word "follows," strike out all the remainder of said section and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"First grade, salary \$1,200; second grade, salary \$1,300; third grade, salary \$1,400; fourth grade, salary \$1,500; fifth grade, salary \$1,600; sixth grade, \$1,700. Clerks and carriers shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade.

"That hereafter the salaries of railway postal clerks shall be graded as follows: Grade 1, at \$1,300; grade 2, at \$1,400; grade 3, at \$1,500; grade 4, at \$1,600; grade 5, at \$1,700; grade 6, at \$1,800; grade 7, at \$1,900; grade 8, at \$2,000; grade 9, at \$2,100; grade 10, at \$2,200."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the gentleman's amendment that the section to which it applies has been passed and is not subject to further amendment.

Mr. DALLINGER. No; we have not passed it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think so, and the point of order is overruled.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered raises the pay of the letter carriers, postal clerks, and railway mail clerks \$200 beyond what the bill as reported provides. I desire to say that I am heartily in favor of this bill, so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough; and I have the temerity, in spite of the violent objections to this legislation on the part of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINY] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] on the ground of extravagance, to offer an amendment of this kind.

The great trouble is that this whole matter is not looked upon from the right point of view. We are not raising the pay of anybody in any of these propositions that have come before Congress. We are simply trying to keep the income of Government employees from diminishing; that is all. [Applause.]

The Government of the United States for the last quarter of a century, because it has maintained a fixed standard of 24 grains of gold to make a dollar, has been paying its employees in a constantly depreciating currency.

The fact that every other commodity has gone up with reference to the dollar is evidence of the fact that one of the principal reasons of the so-called high cost of living in this country has been the depreciation of gold. In other words, 24 grains of gold which make up your standard dollar in this country have become less and less valuable in purchasing power as time has gone on, because on account of scientific study and the development of new machinery it has been possible to bring mines into operation that never before could be operated, thus greatly increasing the amount of gold in existence and in circulation. Even if my amendment prevails, the letter carriers, postal clerks, and railway mail clerks of this country will not be as well off as they were 20 years ago—nowhere near it. That is a fact that can not be successfully contradicted, and I trust that some time there will be statesmanship enough in the Congress of the United States to have adopted some standard that will stabilize the purchasing power of the dollar. When this is done by the adoption of some practicable form of the multiple standard, then a dollar to-day will buy as much of the necessities of life as a dollar 20 years ago or as a dollar 20 years from now, and you will have no occasion to pass such legislation as this in a feeble attempt to do partial justice to the Government employees. I trust that my amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am for the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER], or any other amendment that raises the pay of these postal employees higher. He states that we want to keep the wages going higher, to keep the standard up instead of letting it go lower, and that is very commendable, I believe in that, and at the same time we are doing that we want to keep the standard of wages paid to these Government employees from pulling backward the standard of the wages paid in private industries, and that is just what it does. When the Government employees receive less pay than is paid generally in works of different industries, every time an adjustment of wages is to be made the employers contend and put up the argument that the Government employees are receiving less than is asked of them as private employers. Hence they try to drive the wages down on the strength of the wages paid to Government employees. Moreover, we must not forget this, that right at this time in every part of the country there is great difficulty keeping employees in the Postal Service.

In Pennsylvania men and women are constantly quitting the service to go to something that pays better, and there is a large number of employees at this time, to my certain knowledge, in the State of Pennsylvania who have given notice that they are going to leave the service if an additional advance in wages is not given to them. I believe we ought to raise the standard of these wages higher than has been offered here to-day, and I shall vote for any advance that is offered along that line.

When the Government takes over any industry for operation during the war, the employees in those industries become, at least, semi-Government employees and have a right to expect to receive a consideration in their demands for a living wage the same as when employed by private enterprise, and if this is accorded them the same consideration should be accorded those who have been in the service in times of peace and who are still in it.

As the demands of the country grow in requirements in mail service, the burden on the shoulders of the employees increases, and this with the increased cost of living most certainly appeals in behalf of the higher pay for all these employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the following language in line 1, page 2: "after the passage of this act," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "during the fiscal year 1919."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, this bill, in my opinion, has many vices in it that ought to defeat it somewhere along the line before it finally becomes a law, but in my judgment the worst vice in it is in making it permanent law. As I said a while ago, at the risk of repetition, I do not believe this House can justify itself on any ground at all in making this permanent law, while the amendment carried the other day on the legislative bill was for one year. I recognize that it is unpopular on the floor of the House these days for any man to rise here in defense of the Treasury of the United States or to say one word in defense of the hundreds, yea, the millions of men and women of the country who are called upon to pay the taxes that bear these burdens. I recognize that the man who undertakes to make that argument

on the floor to-day, if he is not openly criticized by some Member, will have it said of him somewhere by some on the floor of the House that he is talking for home consumption. This war can not go on forever. If the increased cost of living is due in part, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] says, to the depreciation in the value of the gold dollar, when this war is over the purchasing power of the dollar will beyond doubt increase and this Nation will soon return to normal times, to normal conditions in the way of the cost of living, and if it does, do you not believe that we are shooting these salaries to the skies, and had we better not pass this amendment and make this proposed raise merely temporary and not fasten this tremendous amount in the way of increased salary upon the people at the close of the war? We are right on the eve of another bond issue; if the papers can be believed, we are soon to be called upon to vote another ten billions of bonds. I hear reports from all sections of the country that it is going to be difficult to float them; but this is not the last bond issue. Oh, no. Others are to follow, and I am heartily in favor of it, because we must go on. We must win this war. No turning back now, but onward we must go until victory is achieved.

And on the heels of that and with these startling facts staring us in the face, if this House ever in all of its history has run eternally wild and gone absolutely crazy and stark mad upon increase of salaries it has certainly done it here this evening, and what this bill will finally carry no man knows. In my opinion, and I base it upon some figures which I had made for me by the Post Office Department, as the bill now stands it is going to cost the country next year not less than \$40,000,000. Twenty-nine million dollars was added the other day to the legislative bill in the way of increased salaries. The Nolan minimum-wage bill, soon to come on the floor for passage if it can get the right of way, carries \$25,000,000 more. A bill reported out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and now on the calendar, increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors, whose salaries now are from \$2,000 to \$3,500 a year, carrying \$146,000 of appropriation.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. For a question only.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman think \$40,000,000 estimated increase would be a larger proportionate increase than the estimated increase of the railway employees at \$350,000,000—

Mr. COX. I do not know anything about that; but I am willing to let every tub stand upon its own bottom and cross every bridge when I get to it. We are going to need money next year. If this war goes on—and to me it comes nearer looking like a 10-years' war than a 2-years' war—we will need it in 1920; yes, in 1921, 1922, and 1923. Had we not better begin here to make a few deductions in these enormous appropriations and save what we can now and be prepared to pay off the staggering debt at the close of this war?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] is greatly alarmed because it is proposed to make permanent the salary increases of the men in the Postal Service. He has expressed the greatest concern lest at the close of the war we should find the cost of the necessities of life declining to the level of prices at the outbreak of the European war without in the meantime repealing the law granting the increases to men in the Postal Service.

It is refreshing to know that the gentleman from Indiana concedes, by implication at least, that the present cost of the necessities of life justifies a temporary increase at any rate. It would have been difficult for him to have refused to concede that, for the cost of practically all of the necessities of life has doubled during the last three years.

But I am glad to discuss the question even upon the basis of prices which existed immediately prior to the outbreak of the European war.

Ninety-five per cent of the men in the Postal Service, clerks and carriers, have not received an increase in salaries for about 10 years, and statistics show that during the period from 1902 until 1914 the average increase in the cost of living had been 40 per cent. In other words, the salaries of these men remained the same, while they were compelled to pay \$1.40 for what they could buy in 1902 for \$1. The deep concern of the gentleman from Indiana about the unfair advantage the postal employees will hold over the Government when prices go back to the standard existing before the war is therefore entirely without justification.

But the gentleman says that the postal employees should bear with the injustices as to compensation because of the expense of the war. That position is entirely unsound. We must first see that the employees of the Government are paid the value of

their services, and then it is time to talk about bearing their share of the financial burden of the war.

After that they should and would be glad to pay taxes on the same basis as others. But to ask men to be satisfied with less than half in value of the salary originally provided for by law is indefensible. The Government as an employer should be just, especially when it is constantly trying, as it should, to compel private employers to be just. Nothing tends to make people more devoted to their Government either in peace or war than the knowledge of the fact that such government is just.

At the present time the Post Office Department earns more than its expenses, is more than self-sustaining. Members opposed to this increase assure us that it will cost more to operate the department if these increases are granted. That is quite true. There is no doubt either that the cost of operation would be greatly reduced if the men were paid only half of their present salaries, but no Member of the House has been bold enough to propose such a plan for reducing the expense of operating the department.

No, gentlemen, this increase in salaries is more than deserved. The average increase provided by the bill, according to the statements of members of the Post Office Committee, is about 16 per cent. It is clear, therefore, that even if prices should return to the standard existing before the war, these men would still be underpaid, for they would still receive 24 per cent less in value than when the last increase was granted, about 10 years ago. This fact should surely calm the fears of gentlemen who fear that the men will get more than that to which they are entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. REED] is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, several months ago the Sixty-fourth Congress of the United States went into the wage-raising business, and seemed to find it expedient and proper to increase the salaries of the railway trainmen. These increases appertain to engineers, conductors, and many other railway employees, and, as I understand it, this was not enacted as temporary legislation.

Now we are proposing to bring the salary of the railway mail clerk up more nearly to that of the engineer behind whom he travels and works in his closed car, in the most dangerous position, probably, to be found on the train, and where he is frequently the helpless victim of a wreck or collision. It is certainly meritorious legislation, and I am opposed to making it temporary legislation in respect to any of the increases proposed in this bill. [Applause.] I shall have no hesitancy in stating my position to my constituents and I am not alarmed by the warnings of some of my colleagues that this act will be characterized as a raid on the Treasury of the United States.

The raid on the Treasury has been on for some time and is approaching from many directions.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. I regret I have not time to yield to my colleague.

Mr. RAINEY. I want to say to the gentleman that this will not be a raid on the Treasury. You have added \$28,000,000 to-day, and that means a 4-cent postage for letters.

Mr. REED. The people are to-day paying a 3-cent rate on letters and 100 per cent increase on postal cards, and their complaint is that they are not getting the service after paying the increased rates. Efficient employees are leaving the Postal Service because they can get better pay in other fields. The rural service is being impaired. Hundreds are resigning, and I am reliably informed that many are now staying in for the time being because they hope to get relief from Congress this year. If they do not, they will leave this work to be done by employees less capable of satisfactory service to the people.

In my State the mines, the oil fields, and the manufacturing concerns are calling for men and offering higher salaries than these employees of the Government are getting. In contracting for the erection of munitions plants and many vast projects incident to prosecuting the war the contractors, in some way, are getting enough out of it to pay the highest wages ever known in this country. I know men, uneducated, not mechanics, not skilled in any of the building arts, getting far higher wages working on these Government projects than the average pay of the postal employees.

We all know the Government is paying for it all. Shall we call it raids on the Treasury that have set these new standards of pay and which make the increases proposed in this bill not only necessary but proper as a matter of simple justice?

Mr. Chairman, this House has already voted to increase the clerks and employees in other branches of the Government service. The work of most of these clerks is of a nature calculated to increase their efficiency in the realm of commerce and business. The stenographer, the bookkeeper, the auditing

clerk, and many others are all the while becoming proficient along lines that will be most valuable to them if they desire to leave the service of the Government at some future time. They have attained prestige and experience that may be capitalized in any State in the Union.

But, Mr. Chairman, the man who spends years acquiring a knowledge of the location of residents of a city, or the box holders of a post office, or the routing of outgoing mails is the possessor of knowledge most valuable for the successful prosecution of his work as a postal employee, but of very little account in any other calling in life.

Each succeeding year, however, he becomes a more efficient servant of the people in the mail service.

The men who spend years in the Railway Mail Service have to pour over the names of counties, cities, and towns until they have thousands of places and names memorized. When they become expert they hold in their brains the geography of a Nation and the complicated transportation systems of a continent. They become experts and specialists, but it is a mental wealth that can not be used except in a limited way in any other vocation or calling. Contrasting the salaries of these employees with the salaries now paid in the industrial and commercial arenas, it is clear, to my mind, that the postal employees are not getting a square deal, and I feel that the people will approve a proper increase of these allowances, as it will mean a continuation of efficient employees in this work that touches every home in our land. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on that amendment.

Mr. MOON. We had better dispose of the amendments before the House, had we not?

Mr. LUNN. I want to speak on the Cox amendment.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, is debate exhausted on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. LUNN. Then I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MOON. That is very good, and I will meet the point by moving that the committee do now rise.

Mr. LUNN. And I will make the point to-morrow morning.

The motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CARAWAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives, Capitol.

My DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been requested by the Liberty Loan Committee to make several addresses in behalf of the campaign which is being waged in my district, I ask a leave of absence for two days from my duties in Congress.

Yours, very truly,

F. C. HICKS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. A general leave to print has been granted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I think it would greatly accommodate the membership of the House if the Speaker would be willing to predict what his probable ruling will be to-morrow as to what will be in order, whether this bill or the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. As a rule, the Chair does not like to cross a stream until he comes to it, but the Chair was asked that question privately by several Members, and he looked the rule up. The rule does not make the bill a continuing order. The House positively set to-morrow for the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and the Chair will so rule if it comes up.

Mr. KEARNS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEARNS. Has there been a general leave to extend remarks?

The SPEAKER. There has on this bill.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record with reference to information concerning casualties.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the question of casualties in France. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MOON. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 23, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required to cover expenses of the recoinage of uncurrent and lightweight gold coin on hand in the mint at Philadelphia and the several Subtreasuries (H. Doc. No. 983); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of War, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Quartermaster Corps of the Army for rent of room in the building of the American Federation of Labor, fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 984); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 282) amending the public-buildings act approved March 4, 1913, providing for the purchase of a site for a public building at Nogales, Ariz., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 400), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3332) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell and convey certain land to the city of Faribault, Minn., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 401), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2448) for the relief of John A. Bingham, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 399), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10221) granting an increase of pension to Richard Groebe; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8975) granting an increase of pension to William F. Slack; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 10953) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act to amend laws for preventing collisions of vessels and to regulate equipments of certain motor

boats on navigable waters of the United States"; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS: A bill (H. R. 10954) to change the name of the United States Naval Observatory, at Washington, D. C.; to transfer the same to the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON: A bill (H. R. 10955) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 10956) to make The Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10957) to establish the standard of weights and measures for flours, meals, and commercial feeding stuffs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 10958) providing pensions at the rate of \$30, \$32, \$35, \$38, and \$40 per month, for certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, according to age and service; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) to amend sections 1, 2, 5, 11, and 14 of the food-control act by empowering and authorizing the President to control the distribution of and fix prices of wearing apparel, hides, leather, cotton, wool, meat, live stock, and various grains, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment, and to further amend by adding 2 new sections to said act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10959) granting an increase of pension to George W. Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10960) granting an increase of pension to Fletcher Duling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10961) granting an increase of pension to Henry N. Tippet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 10962) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Bainter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 10963) granting an increase of pension to John H. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRUKKER: A bill (H. R. 10964) granting an increase of pension to Charles Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 10965) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of B. S. McHenry and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 10966) granting a pension to Eliza M. Keyes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 10967) granting an increase of pension to Sedonia Annie Smedley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 10968) granting an increase of pension to James A. Rives; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 10969) granting an increase of pension to D. Winslow Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Miss RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 10970) for the relief of Thomas W. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 10971) granting an increase of pension to John McGuire; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 10972) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus B. Manahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 10973) granting a pension to Michael Walsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By The SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Thomas Farm Club, urging higher prices for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies of New York City, favoring House bill 9223, to exempt legacies for religious, educational, or philanthropic purposes from the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Fortnightly Club of Milton Junction, Wis., against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Hon. E. W. Lawrence, mayor, and others, of Meadville, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 7995, for preservation of Commodore Perry's flagship in Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the Barbers Supply Dealers' Association, and resolution of the Placerville Shakespeare Club, Placerville, Cal., requesting the repeal of the zone system for second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of Kings County Pharmaceutical Society, favoring passage of House bill 5531, relative to status of pharmacists in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of members of the executive committee of the Farm Bureau of Cass County, Mo., asking for a price of \$2.75 per bushel on the 1918 wheat crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Kings County Pharmaceutical Society, favoring passage of House bill 5531, relative to status of pharmacists in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Irish women, favoring freedom for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: Memorial of Polish people of north Chicago, Ill., against detachment from Poland of the Chelm district by the Prussians and Austrians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Lithuanians of Chicago, Ill., favoring independence of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Chicago Peoples' Council, favoring an Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Peter Van Schwack & Sons, of Chicago, favoring House bill 5531 to establish a pharmaceutical corps in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Maywood (Ill.) Bird Club, against permitting grazing or shooting in the national parks and reservations; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petitions of numerous citizens of Massachusetts, urging the passage of the Madden bill to increase the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of First Baptist Church, Congregational Church, and Methodist Episcopal Church, of Sunnyvale, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Resolutions adopted by the Paris Literary Club, of Paris, Ky., protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Emma Long, Kittie Snyder, Mrs. C. M. Scarborough, Mrs. Luge Jaenson, and 46 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of George Dice, Z. L. Melick, Clara Kirkpatrick, Clara Rhen, Mrs. M. J. Chamberlin, Mary J. Vance, Miss Nellie E. Skiff, Ellen Flesher, and 30 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. R. Wicker, Addison Blanchard, and 40 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of M. C. Guldberg, L. J. Stiles, A. Belle Scales, Mrs. M. H. Davison, and 28 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Elwood Allen, John Otto, jr., William A. Gosmer, and 176 others, all citizens of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Elmer R. Brown, E. Parker, R. P. Barnes, E. L. Walker, Emma T. Tyler, Ira C. Lugg, D. J. Parker, M. L. Reep, J. H. Killian, W. E. Eichelberger, Alleen Meyer, and 68 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. C. N. Woodward, Mrs. P. M. Osborne, E. E. Curry, C. E. Mathias, Mae Coombs, G. R. Gentry, B. A. Sweet, and 43 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Lemuel M. Sumner, E. T. Saunders, F. T. Lawson, May Ballentine, Fred L. Winfrey, and 19 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Halsted L. Ritter, L. De V. Regnier, W. G. Andry, and 37 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado; praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, March 23, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy guidance and blessing as we face the vast responsibilities of this day. Rules are in the course of preparation in this Chamber that will affect the conduct of millions of Thy people and go out under the authority of law. We pray that in dealing with these most delicate and most important duties and obligations we may seek with true and fervent hearts Thy divine guidance, and that we may realize that every step of the way is being taken under the immediate direction of Thy holy spirit. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 206).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting additional estimates of appropriation in the sum of \$2,890 required by the Treasury Department for the service of the fiscal year 1919, office of Comptroller of the Currency; office of Surgeon General, Public Health Service, and Section of Surety Bonds, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ELIZABETH H. RICE V. UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 205).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the cause of Elizabeth H. Rice v. The United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have a petition from the North Dakota Bankers' Association, in the form of a resolution, requesting an amendment of the law so as to divide the payment of excess-profits taxes into four annual installments, which I move may be referred to the proper committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I also have here a resolution from the Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly reciting, among other things, that the courts of the United States are a most serious menace to the constitutional rights of the American people; that the power now exercised by the courts to declare laws passed by a legislative body unconstitutional was expressly denied the judiciary by the convention that framed our Federal Constitution; that the constitutional rights of the American people are not secure while an irresponsible oligarchy are permitted to exercise the powers above enumerated; that there are problems in modern industrial life that must be solved by the ordinary machinery of popular government; and that if the courts continue to hamper the people in the exercise of that sovereign power then the courts must be controlled by the people. Therefore it was resolved "that we demand that Congress shall immediately prepare and submit to the people through the proper channels an amendment to the United States Constitution providing for the election of all Federal judges with short terms of office and placing the power in the people to recall Federal judges, the only place that power should reside," and requesting me to give this resolution the consideration which it deserves.

In accordance with that request, Mr. President, I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and there receive the consideration which I ask for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THOMAS. I present a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Trinidad, Las Animas County, Colo., referring to the coal situation in that State. I ask that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows: